

GENERAL LIBRARY
JAN 14 1921
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Classical Journal

JAN 14 1921

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XVI

JANUARY 1921

Number 4

Editorial	193
Latin as an International Language	W. A. Oldfather 195
"Quid Rides?"	Ruth Jensen 207
Nil Sine Magno Vita Læbore Dedit Mortalibus	J. O. Lofberg 220
Cicero and the Agrarian Proposals of 63 B.C.	Evan T. Sage 230
Some Greek and French Parallels	Walter R. Agard 237
Notes	
Homeric Reminiscences	J. G. Winter 243
The Aorist Participle in <i>Odyssey</i> ii. 3	John A. Scott 245
Current Events	247
Book Reviews	254
<i>Materials and Methods of Literary Criticism: Lyric, Epic, and Allied Forms of Poetry</i> , Gayly and Kurtz (Prescott); <i>W. S. Teuffels Geschichte der römischen Literatur</i> , Kroll und Skutsch (E. T. M.).	
Recent Books	256

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO
FUKUOKA, SENDAI
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER

The University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER

The University of Kansas

For New England

SIDNEY N. DEANE
Smith College

For the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
The University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE

Harvard University

WALTER MILLER

The University of Missouri

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN

East High School, Cleveland

JULIANNE A. ROLLER

Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

CLARENCE W. GLEASON

Roxbury Latin School, Boston

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN

New York City

GEORGE HOWE

University of North Carolina

JOHN A. SCOTT

Northwestern University

BERTHOLD L. ULLMAN

University of Iowa

BERTHA GREEN

Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

The Classical Journal is published monthly except in July, August, and September at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 20 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoaan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 12s. 6d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 7d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUKEI-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MINASAN BOOK COMPANY, 13 North Szechuan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to ROLLIN H. TANNER, Denison University, Granville, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to JOHN S. GALBRAITH, Williams-town, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to JAMES T. ALLEN, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this Association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to SIDNEY N. DEANE, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

Entered as second-class matter, May 26, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of July 16, 1894.
Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1927, authorized on August 22, 1928.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XVI

JANUARY 1921

NUMBER 4

Editorial

Following established practice, in accordance with which a report of the Association's financial affairs is published as soon as possible after the close of each fiscal year, the Treasurer submits herewith the balance sheet for the years 1918-19 and 1919-20.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

	1920	1919
Cash	\$ 975.53	\$ 531.72
<i>Classical Journal</i>	3,403.57	3,328.15
<i>Classical Philology</i>	245.80	258.00
Clerical help	383.12	371.95
Postage	157.98	222.37
Vice-Presidents	86.90	113.43
Miscellaneous printing	81.05	158.25
Editors' office	25.10	33.96
Annual meeting	360.97	160.16
Sundries	44.81	2.15
Journal Index		355.75
Publicity Committee		29.33
American Classical League	198.25	
Total	<u>\$5,963.08</u>	<u>\$5,565.22</u>
Balance from preceding year	\$ 531.72	\$ 578.11
Membership dues	3,437.15	3,223.14
University of Chicago Press	1,986.48	1,763.97
Journal Index	7.73	
Total	<u>\$5,963.08</u>	<u>\$5,565.22</u>

We have examined the books of the Treasurer of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South for the year September 1, 1919, to August 31, 1920, and have found them correct.

EDWIN L. FINDLEY

M. FOSTER LEWIS

ROLLIN H. TANNER

Auditing Committee

In submitting the report for my last year as Treasurer of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, I have included the corresponding items for the preceding year, for the sake of comparison. The cash balance, \$975.53, is the largest balance which I have been able to submit in my five years of service. In 1916 the cash balance was \$970.50. Since then it has been steadily diminishing until the past year.

The item of expense for the American Classical League represents the actual amount turned over to the Treasurer of that organization for membership dues. The expenses of the canvass conducted by my office were borne by the American Classical League, so that the item mentioned does not represent any outlay on our part, but merely funds collected by us and transferred to the other organization.

The amount of money received in commissions from the University of Chicago Press has shown a gratifying increase. In 1917 the amount was \$1,512.58, almost \$500 less than the amount received last year. This increase in amount represents the increased circulation of the *Classical Journal* outside our own territory.

In retiring from the office of Treasurer of the Classical Association I wish to thank the members of the Association who by their courtesy and forbearance have made the task of its Treasurer lighter and more agreeable. I am very glad to have had the privilege of serving the Association in this way, and my congratulations and best wishes are extended to the new Treasurer, Mr. Rollin H. Tanner.

Respectfully submitted,

LOUIS E. LORD, *Treasurer*

LATIN AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE¹

BY W. A. OLDFATHER
The University of Illinois

Before proceeding to discuss the suitability of Latin for certain uses as an auxiliary language in international scientific communication, let me present briefly a statement of the present situation of the proposal, so that any of you who may not be informed of certain of the most recent movements and actions may the better realize the timeliness of the consideration of this matter, and the truly remarkable opportunity which seems to lie before us at the present moment to do something to promote the unity of civilization now and for all time to come, as well as to render a lasting service to the cause of classical studies.

A new epoch was marked in the long struggle for a universal means of communication, at the time of the Paris Exposition in 1900, when a volunteer committee undertook to present certain principles which should guide scholars and scientists in the selection of an international language. These principles, which have received well-nigh universal acceptance, are briefly, (1) that the proposed language should serve as an auxiliary, without displacing the national languages; (2) that it should be easily adaptable to all the usages of human life; (3) that it should be so simple as to be readily learned with the minimum of effort; (4) that it should not be one of "the national languages now in use."

Latin had been seriously proposed as the international language at least as early as 1889, and during the next quarter-century the question was widely discussed whether classical Latin or some modification thereof was the more practicable, several short-lived journals were founded, and a number of specimens of a simplified and enlarged Latin offered for consideration. But it was first in the strain of the Great War that the present phase of the movement

¹A paper read before the Classical League on the occasion of its meeting at Cincinnati, June 23, 1920. Printed as read.

came into existence, and it is that which primarily concerns us now. Let me indicate briefly a few of the more recent manifestations of interest in the problem which have come to my attention. In *Nature* for February 10, 1916, the eminent English physician, Dr. Lauder Brunton, wrote vigorously in support of Latin as an international language, and in the discussion which followed in that journal a number of scholars and scientists warmly supported the proposal. At about the same time Professor Aldo Mieli also wrote in behalf of Latin in the *Rivista di Storia delle Scienze mediche e naturali* for 1916. In January, 1917, Professor Ignazio Galli, a meteorologist, published in the *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana dei Nuovi Lincei* a lucid discussion of the inadequacy of the various artificial languages, Volapük, Esperanto, Ido, Simpló, and the like, and a cogent statement of the case for Latin. A few months later Professor Carlo Pascal, of the Royal Academy of Lombardy at Milan, proposed that Latin be adopted as the international language, and the Academy voted its approval, going even so far as to suggest a general consideration of the question among learned societies. In the fall of 1917 articles upon "Latin as an International Language," and "Science and the International Language Question" appeared in the *Review of Reviews* and the *Scientific American*, respectively. In the spring of 1918 Professor Pike, of the University of Minnesota, read a valuable paper on the subject before the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, which was printed in the *Classical Journal* for October, 1918. In the early summer of the same year a "Committee appointed by the Prime Minister to enquire into the position of Modern Languages in the educational system of Great Britain," presented to Parliament, among other things, the following recommendation: "That a Committee be appointed to enquire into the potentialities of artificial languages and the desirability of encouraging the development and use of one," and an earnest discussion of the need of such an international language took place in the columns of the *London Times* during the summer of that year. In the summer of 1919 a beautiful and sumptuously printed bi-monthly journal entitled *Janus, Universalis Latini Revista*, under the management of M. Andreas Lambert, devoted to the revival and spread of the

Latin language, began to appear in Paris, giving evidence that scholarship, taste, and means are devoted to the cause in that brilliant capital. In March, 1920, Professor L. J. Paetow of the University of California published in the *Classical Journal* an effective plea for "Latin as a Universal Language," and Professor H. C. Nutting of the same institution contributed a suggestive editorial on "Latin as a Tool" in the same number. On June 30 Professor Paetow will again present the case for Latin, this time before the classical teachers of the Pacific slope.¹

The matter had by this time begun to pass beyond the realm of academic discussion and assume the rôle of a serious practical question. At its meeting in Brussels, September 18-28, 1919, the International Research Council adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, (a) That the International Research Council appoint a committee to investigate and report to it the present status and possible outlook of the general problem of an international auxiliary language; (b) That the committee be authorized to co-operate in its studies with other organizations engaged in the same work,

Provided, That nothing in these resolutions shall be interpreted as giving the committee any authority to commit the Council to adhesion to or approval of any particular project either in whole or in part.

Chairmen of committees for the United States, France, Italy, Japan, and Belgium were appointed at once, and a committee of four for Great Britain a few weeks later by the British Association for the Advancement of Science, with which committee one appointed by the British Classical Association is reported to be co-operating. The matter has also been brought to the attention of a number of representative bodies, such as scientific societies, chambers of commerce, and the like, in France, Italy, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Spain, and elsewhere, as a few preliminary notices of action from different localities in these countries seem to indicate. In our own country the very competent chairman of the committee is Dr. F. G. Cottrell, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Mines, Washington, D.C., who has taken up his duties actively in endeavoring to secure consideration of the general question by

¹ The paper then delivered, entitled "The Future of Latin," has appeared in the *Classical Weekly*, October, 1920, pp. 17-19.

the great scientific societies and institutions, and by appointing committees in many, and perhaps eventually all, of our larger universities, in order to secure the widest possible discussion of the proposal, and in the end a thoughtfully considered and truly representative report from the United States.

I might also add that the whole question has been brought officially to the attention of Lord Robert Cecil, British representative of the League of Nations, and to Sir Eric Drummond, secretary of the same, and it may well be hoped that this League, or some modification of it, will find in the furtherance of a common language of communication one of the most potent means of creating a permanent international good will, upon which all right-thinking men have set their heart.

And here I must pause to say that this information about the general action of the International Research Council and related matters has been furnished me in confidence by Dr. Cottrell, with the understanding that no statement regarding them be made in the daily press until the organizations which are being consulted "shall have made their own publication through their regular channels," so that I must request all of you, and in particular any representatives of the press who may be present, to treat this part of what I have to say as in confidence, a matter which may be discussed, indeed, freely between individuals but which should not be published abroad as yet.

Now it seems to be agreed in discussions since the year of the Paris Exposition, that no existing national language can possibly be chosen. International jealousies are far too powerful to allow any single nation or group of nations to gain for itself the cultural prestige and the tremendous economic advantage which the selection of some language already in use would secure to those who speak it as their mother-tongue. This is altogether aside from such almost insuperable difficulties as the spelling and certain sounds in English, the pronunciation of French, the involved character of German, the relatively small number of Italians, the scantiness of scientific and literary production of a high order in Spanish, or the immense difficulties of several kinds which inhere in Russian.

The question narrows down, in fact, at the very outset to a choice between an ancient language and some one of the many artificial languages. Among these, to mention only a few of the best known, Volapük has almost entirely disappeared, and Neutral Idiom is vanishing, Esperanto is said to be waning somewhat since its high-water mark about 1908, Simplo seems to have made no stir outside of Italy, and Ido, a modified Esperanto, though supported by such names as Couturat, Jesperson, and Ostwald, can hardly be said to be making rapid progress. All suffer to a greater or less degree from what many feel to be an excessive uniformity and hence monotony in sound and appearance, inflexibility, a bizarre and sometimes even a weird appearance, and the apparent inability ever truly to satisfy the deep-seated instinct for a certain distinction and elevation of character which civilized mankind will always, I believe, demand in an instrument so intimately associated with life upon its higher levels as is language. Finally it might well be feared that the widespread adoption of any such artificial language might tend to superinduce a truly sterilizing severance from the whole of our inspiring and meaningful past.

If this very brief and admittedly incomplete characterization of the artificial languages be allowed (for I am concerned here not so much in considering them as in presenting such case as can be made for Latin), it follows that some so-called dead language, i.e., one which is fixed and no longer liable to marked variation by the minds and tongues of its users, must be adopted. Of course that simply means Latin, but before stating its claims to consideration, let me present some of the principal objections that have been urged against it, and endeavor in part to answer them, or at least reduce them to reasonable proportions.

Latin is called a hard language, somewhat complicated and irregular. This is true, but I do not believe that Latin is excessively difficult. And here we have the test of human experience and actual use. Millions of people not born to it have mastered it, some of whom have wielded it with extraordinary power, as witness not a few great names in old Latin literature, Plautus, Ennius, Terence, Apuleius, or the thousands of able writers in that language who have lived since the beginning of the Middle Ages. Besides at this

moment it is still the liturgical and official language of the great Roman Catholic church, many thousands of whose leaders employ it regularly in speech no less than in writing.

It is said to be ill adapted to commercial intercourse, but the base of all business language is Latin, and from what other source came such terms as *debit*, *credit*, *port*, *charge*, *bill*, *auction*, *per cent*, *item*, *receipt*, *sum*, *expense*, *double entry*, and scores of others without which business would be dumb today? Besides business language is almost as formulaic as some kinds of mathematics. A few hundred words and a few dozen formulas constitute the entire technical vocabulary of business. Now anyone who has even a rudimentary acquaintance with Latin laws and inscriptions knows how readily Latin, "marble's language, pure, discrete," lends itself to concise and meaningful formulas. A glance at Mommsen's edition and commentary of the wax account books of L. Caecilius Jucundus, the auctioneer of Pompeii, or Beigel's sizable monograph upon Roman methods of calculation and bookkeeping, is sufficient to allay doubts touching the adaptability of Latin for the conduct of business; and only those who are ignorant of Plautus, Petronius, and the *graffiti* will deny that Latin may be used in easy-going and informal intercourse.

It is also urged that Latin as an inflected language is in opposition to the modern tendency toward analytic forms of speech. It is true that many modern languages are less inflected, but the movement toward analysis has wholly or almost wholly ceased. In the last hundred years very few inflectional endings have been discarded in the languages of Western Europe, and changes are almost wholly restricted to sounds and vocabulary. Inflection involves no very serious difficulties for Teutons and Slavs, and these latter must count for more and more as time goes on by virtue of their numbers—before long one-half of Europe will speak a Slavic language—and their undoubted ability.

But Latin has been used and rejected, we are told. True again, but the linguistic conditions which face the modern world are very different indeed from those in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when Latin lost its one-time primacy as a means of communication between educated men. If it be wise for a statesman

to draft laws with an eye upon the clock, it is still more so for one who would mark out the lines along which the nations of the world shall conduct their intercourse. Then the centrifugal and differentiating forces were at their maximum and each nation under the powerful ferment and dynamic of Renaissance and Reformation was striking out recklessly to all forms of separatism, and the insistence upon the national speech was but one of many kindred manifestations. Now such individualistic tendencies are out of step with the spirit of the age. Despite certain superficial appearances, the nationalism now rampant is only political, and even there cast in international molds, as the governments of the new European states, far from varying according to race, language, tradition, and geography, as they once did, look as much alike as the clothes in which the politicians of the different countries dress themselves. In unions, leagues, agreements, in music, science, social activities, business, dress, sport, and recreation, the peoples of Europe are becoming more and more uniform; only in politics and language is there a further, but perhaps only an apparent, diversification, offset in the one case by the ideal of leagues and unions, and in the other by the rapidly growing insistence upon an international means of communication. Then the line of least resistance lay in writing one's own language and acquiring a reading knowledge of two or at the most three others, and that was probably easier than to compose constantly in Latin. But with the increasing number of languages in which substantial work that ought not to be overlooked is constantly appearing and in increasing quantities, the whole situation has changed. It may be easier to learn to read French and German, or even French and German and Italian, than it would be to learn to write Latin, yet I doubt it; but no one can deny that even the most tongue-tied could learn to write Latin more easily than to add to his French, German, and Italian, Russian, Polish, Swedish, Dutch, Danish, Spanish, and the multitude of other languages which are even now being employed as the medium of scientific and scholarly production, while in the near future we must count upon the rise of a copious literature which cannot be neglected in Asiatic languages—Arabic, Hindustani, Chinese, and Japanese. With the enlargement of one's audience

through ease of travel and transportation, and with the growing world-interdependence in thought and business, we must secure a means of linguistic communication within the next few decades, or condemn ourselves to permanent embarrassment and confusion.

Finally, it is not necessary in order to use a language that one compose masterpieces in it. Not everyone born to English will write as Shakespeare and Burke, nor need all who use Latin write like Cicero and Horace. That one express his generally simple ideas in reasonably clear and correct Latin is all that would be required, and allowances would always have to be made for inexact thinking and slovenly expression. Those who do not employ English with grace and distinction, and there are said to be such even among learned men, will probably not employ Latin with grace and distinction, but they will no doubt be able to make themselves understood in Latin as they now are understood in English, and that is all that any advocate of a universal language would hope for.

And now let me present in the very briefest form a few of the arguments which may be urged in behalf of Latin by a classicist.

In the first place Latin, greatly enriched by Greek in Latinized formations, is now the actual language of science, either exactly as Cicero would write the words, or else with a slight modification of spelling and suffix necessary to adapt it to the genius of the national language into which the terms have been incorporated.

Let me call your attention to a few especially striking instances of this: for the field of pharmacy I shall quote a paragraph from Dr. Bernard Fantus: "The superscription, inscription, and subscription, being addressed to the pharmacist, are to be written in Latin, for the following reasons: (1) The Latin names of drugs are more definite, concise, and unchangeable. (2) A Latin prescription can be understood and compounded by pharmacists all over the civilized world." Similar is the statement in Hallberg: "Because it is a language with which most scholars are familiar, because of its flexibility, and from the fact that it is employed in prescription

¹ *Prescription Writing and Pharmacy* (Chicago, 1906). Reason (3), which one may hope in time to render less valid, runs, "Because it is generally best to have the patient in ignorance as to composition of the medicine he is taking."

writing, Latin has by common consent been adopted in the naming of drugs and pharmaceutical preparations.”¹

In anatomy one of the great forward steps was taken in 1895 by the adoption at Basel, after the labors of a commission which extended over eight years, of the so-called “Basle Nomina Anatomica,” in which some 4,500 terms were adopted out of about 30,000 that had previously been employed. I quote now from Dean A. C. Eycleshymer: “The Committee expressly states that while its official language is Latin, it does not wish to impose the slightest restriction on the translation of these terms into any language. Anatomists, however, are using quite uniformly the Latin terms, and are thereby greatly facilitating the development of anatomic science through a common language.”²

Similar is the condition recently introduced into botany because of the confusion arising from an excessive and unregulated employment of national languages. I quote from the “International Rules for Botanical Nomenclature, adopted by the International Congress of Botany at Vienna, 1905, second edition, revised with reference to the decisions of the International Congress of Botany at Brussels, 1910. Jena, 1912.” Article 36: “On and after January 1, 1908, the publication of names of new groups of recent plants will be valid only when they are accompanied by a Latin diagnosis.” Article 36 bis: “On and after January 1, 1912, the publication of names of new groups of fossil plants will be valid only when they are accompanied by a Latin diagnosis,” etc. Recommendation 20: “Botanists will do well . . . when publishing names of new groups in works written in a modern language (floras, catalogues, etc.) to publish simultaneously the Latin diagnosis, and in paleontology also the figures, which will make the names valid from the point of view of scientific nomenclature.”

In mathematics it might be noted that Professor Peano of Turin successfully published for a few years after 1904 the *Rivista de Mathematica* in the so-called *Interlingua*, or *Latino sine flexione*, a slightly simplified Latin of Professor Peano’s own construction, and about the same time brought out a series of monographs upon

¹ *Lectures on Pharmacy* (Chicago, 1905).

² *Anatomical Names* (New York, 1917), p. viii.

his well-known *Formulario Mathematico* in the same language, which is, I may add, most extraordinarily easy to read. I need merely mention such great works as Newton's *Principia* and Euler's *Methodus Inveniendi Lineas Curvas* as examples of how the most abstruse mathematical treatises can be composed successfully in classical Latin.

In chemistry the names and symbols of all the elements are Latin, and the chemists, by making some few additions for the most recent work in certain fields, have already available, when they care to make use of it, a complete Latin terminology for the science, now employed by the pharmacists.

In zoölogy the case is similar, and it may be of interest to note that the Japanese have recently established a journal called *Annotationes Zoologicae Japonenses*, although the articles are published in modern languages, mainly, I believe, English.

As is the case in science, Latin is likewise the basis of all legal, political, and literary nomenclature, a point which need not be labored in this connection.

Again Latin has passed into the modern languages not merely in the shape of fully assimilated words, the originals of which will always be recognized, but also in unchanged Latin expressions, current all over the world today, which are recognized and understood by men of any education at all. I mean such words or phrases as *exit, bona fide, alma mater, de jure, casus belli, ultimatum, cum grano salis, habeas corpus, per se, alter ego, anno Domini, summum bonum, sine qua non, pro, contra, extra, data, tertium quid, mutatis mutandis, obiter dictum, sub rosa*, and many scores of others.

Latin connects us with our past, without due regard for which no civilization can well prosper, or even long maintain itself.

Latin is fixed, no longer amenable to such changes that the words and work of one generation become difficult for another to understand. When a new concept appears a newly formed Latin (or Latinized Greek) word would be immediately applied to it, and not, as in modern languages is too often the case, a new meaning given to an old word, with all the inconveniences which such a procedure involves.

Fully 90 per cent of the leaders in science, literature, the humanities, law, and politics know something at least of Latin, and probably the majority of the leaders in business enterprises. And even those who do not know some Latin directly may very easily acquire it from the knowledge which they already have of the Latin element in their own language, and especially from all technical terminologies.

Latin contains an extensive literature of almost all varieties, philosophic, religious, political, ethical, legal, historical, scientific, belletristic, an inexhaustible field of reading and study for all who know even the elements of the language in which to enlarge their knowledge, improve their minds, and enrich and refine their style, at the same time that they are acquiring a ready means of communication with men of other nations.

Finally, Latin is now here and on the spot. It exists already as a universal language; it needs only to be utilized. And the machinery for teaching it is also in operation. There are now in the civilized world tens of thousands of persons who devote all or part of their time to the teaching of the language, and, if occasion should arise, their numbers could be swiftly multiplied.

Of course some changes in the present methods of instruction would be required. Less of superfluous grammatical and stylistic refinements, etymology, and mere antiquities would have to be imparted, and a great deal more attention would have to be paid to writing and speaking. Fortunately these are modifications of method altogether in line with the most recent and wholesome tendencies in the modern teaching of Latin. More is being read, recited, spoken, written *in* the language, than was the case recently, and, with the incentive given by the adoption of Latin as a universal means of communication, this tendency would be strengthened to the benefit of Latin studies in general.

Latin scholars, if Latin becomes the world's language will no doubt stand ready to co-operate with scientists and men of affairs in the establishment of an international academy which will fix forms and usages of new words, determine pronunciation, and from time to time issue new lexicons of the enlarged and adapted speech of ancient Rome.

And, finally, among friends of the classics, I need not hesitate to point out our own ideal, and to some extent also our material interest in the solution of this great question. For a cause does not cease to be right, if it is right to begin with, just because its attainment actually coincides with the advantage of a particular group. If Latin becomes the language of the world, we Latinists will be rid once for all of the libel that we pursue impractical studies. Our defensive will automatically become that cardinal principle of sound strategy, the offensive-defensive. We shall have a new incentive with which to support the occasionally drooping spirit. More than ever we shall face, as did ancient Janus, forward as well as backward, and we can feel that our task is no longer mainly to preserve, but yet more even than in the past to promote, to advance, and to propagate.

“QUID RIDES?”

BY RUTH JENSEN
Columbia University

Many have been the attempts to explain and justify the fact of laughter. For fact it is, and in spite of differing theories men laugh as they love and worship—as if there were no such thing as philosophy. According to the principle of natural selection, the fact of laughter is much of its justification. In the countless changes through which life passes in its evolution, all species of form and action have at some point of time their opportunity. If helpful they persist; if not, they die out. Laughter has persisted; it is this day man's possession in fee simple.

This attempt is to define some of the legion theories of laughter; to view Plautus' comic genius in the light of these; lastly to give a philistine interpretation (I fear) of his homespun genius, regarding him also as typical of his age. For an author is as much the expression of his own personality, race, and period of history as he is a conformist or non-conformist to the broad, general rules of his art.

Theories of the comic have been only less few than theories of beauty and morality. Aristotle in his ex cathedra fashion condemns Plautus unborn. Comedy is an imitation of characters of a lower type—not, however, in the full sense of the word bad. The ludicrous, $\tauὸ γελοῖον$, is a subdivision of the ugly, $\tauὸ αἰσχρόν$, and consists in “some defect or ugliness which is not painful or destructive.” Aristotle really sets forth no expanded or adequate theory; he condemns wholesale, snappishly. Tragedy and the epic rank high; comedy is dismissed without audience. It will be seen from these *peu de mots* that Aristotle placed the ludicrous wholly in character, omitting any consideration of the comic value of situation. To be sure the comic does not exist outside of the pale of what is human; but human touches more than “character.” Further by an association characteristically Hellenic, $\tauὸ αἰσχρόν$, physical,

is linked with *τὸ αἰσχρόν*, moral; ("ugly" and "disgraceful" are this day confused). Therein lies the germ of the principle of degradation.

No higher regard for the comic comes from the brain of two philosophical Englishmen, some centuries separated from their father in theory. These are Sir Thomas Hobbes and Sir Philip Sidney, the literary idealist. Plautus ere now has made his comic bow and departed this world. Of these Hobbes is the more articulate. It is to be noted that when Hobbes asserts his dogma, *illo punto iemporis*, Molière across the channel nullifies it. But Hobbes's doctrine has nevertheless acquired just fame. "The passion of laughter is nothing else but sudden glory arising from a sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves by comparison with the inferiority of others or with our own formerly." Laughter, then, arises not immediately from a perception of something low or undignified, but meditately from this perception. In enjoying the ludicrous, we consciously realize superiority. Laughter has a characteristic taste of contempt. To Hobbes the comic writer is not a humorist but a satirist. Again the principle of degradation.

A later twist in this theory from "those who know," is that of Alexander Bain. "The occasion of the ludicrous is the degradation of some person or interest possessing dignity, in circumstances that excite no other emotion." Here as in Aristotle's theory certain limiting conditions, e.g., absence of counteracting emotions such as pity or disgust, are recognized. But the fundamental theory is unchanged. Comedy, then, is permissible as literature but does not rank very high. The comic playwright shows up the foibles of mankind with something of a superior delight; the audience view the same with a superior (perhaps unconscious), yet contemptuous air. Comedy has no sublime function akin to tragedy's *katharsis*.

The distinctive mark of another theory is that instead of placing behind our enjoyment of the ludicrous an emotion, i.e., a sense of superiority, it premises a purely intellectual attitude—a lofty conception of laughter, yet narrowly definitive. Laughter results from an effect upon our intellectual faculties such as the nullification of a process of expectation or expectant tendency. This follows an

attempt to bring together things too incongruous to be combined. The mind expecting to find something, finds nothing. This disinterested intellectual process results in the feeling of the ludicrous and its expression in laughter. Those who voice this philosophy are Kant and Schopenhauer; and it is indeed a characteristic German philosophy of the nineteenth century which regards all human conduct from a purely rational standpoint. Laughter, then, is menial to the hard taskmistress, Reason.

Two men of the last and present generation have unique opinions about comedy and the comic theory. Bergson, the French psychologist, frankly states at the beginning of his famous essay¹ the difficulty of isolating an element common to a number of things. "What common ground can we find between the grimace of a merry-andrew, a play upon words, an equivocal situation in a burlesque, and a scene in high comedy?"

Bergson begins with some fundamental observations:

1. Laughter has a deep social significance; it is always in the pale of the strictly human; it must re-echo as far as possible in society. It cannot be the esoteric laugh of a gloomy satirist or of anyone aloof or superior. (Comic here receives a more lofty place than Aristotle would give it.)

2. The relation of art to the comic. Comedy, a contrast to other arts, lies midway between art and life; by transferring laughter to the stage, it creates works which belong to art, their aim being to please. On the other hand, comedy accepts social life as a natural environment; here it differs from permanent art which is a breaking away from society and an effort to reveal pure nature.

After this broad and acceptable exegesis of the comic, Bergson proceeds in a very novel manner to reduce all forms of the ludicrous to a substitution in movement or language or action of the mechanical rigidity (*raideur*) of a machine, for the suppleness and changeability of an organism. The comic character does not make a study of others as well as himself. Rigidity, automatism, absent-mindedness, unsociability, are all mingled in his character. This absent-mindedness lives upon him without forming an integral

¹ *Le Rire*.

part of his being—a sort of De Bergerac nose encumbering the free exercise of his faculties. This rigidity at the root of the comic compels its subjects to adhere to one line of action and follow this unswervingly. This is rather after Jonson's definition of humor: "A peculiar quality overcoming a man, making him incline all one way."

Along this line Bergson points out an essential difference between tragedy and comedy in the portrayal of character. Tragedy is concerned with individuals, comedy with classes of individuals. The writer of tragedy need not study other men as must the writer of comedy. The former works introspectively, scanning in himself all the variety of man he might have been; the latter observes objectively other men. It may happen that the comic playwright is himself in one direction a fit subject for comedy; if so, he would not be conscious that he is ridiculous because his unsocial rigidity would remain hidden from his own consciousness.

To round out his theory, Bergson sees this *raideur* not only in comic character and action but even in comic words. After an elaboration on the much-discussed terms wit and humor, he concludes that words become comic by "repetition," "inversion," "reciprocal interference," these being artificial restrictions and bonds upon their normal usage.

In high contrast to a psychologist's attitude is that of a man of letters. In one thing do Bergson and Meredith agree—both place comedy on a much higher literary and mental plane than do their predecessors in criticism. In elevating comedy, Meredith is careful to exorcise what to him are not true types of comedy and the comic spirit. He distinguishes "high" comedy, the comedy of manners, from lower forms, for instance, romantic comedy and farce. Meredith finds but few plays and playwrights who have reached the heights of pure comedy untainted by farce. Evidently true comedy is a thing more difficult to achieve than tragedy (a sheer contradiction of Aristotle). Comedy's function is to paint manners, i.e., conventional life (cf. Bergson's society vs. nature). Meredith's tribute, then, would belong to a narrow class of literary artists, those who most closely have conformed to Cicero's definition of comedy, "imitatio vitae, speculum con-

suetudinis, *imago veritatis.*" The few great comic poets, according to Meredith, have been philosophers who thought deeply on life—Menander, Terence, Molière, Congreve—for these have painted manners. The laughter of this true comedy is impersonal and of great politeness; it is nearer a smile. It is thoughtful and spiritual, the laughter of the mind for the mind directs it. In this Meredith follows the aristocratic tendency of a Sidney or a Landor who would despise the laughter of abandon—carefree, hearty, and robust. Says Landor with Meredith, "Genuine humor and true wit require a sound and capacious mind, which is always a grave one." Yet for Meredith the comic muse is not contemptuous; she is restrained and thoughtful but in no way anti-social. The Comic Spirit is the child of common sense. It is the laughter which is to set a measure upon society when it becomes disproportionate in any way. It lives and breathes by happy chance outside of its traditional dramatic form; for instance, his *Egoist* Meredith frankly calls a comedy in narrative form. Nay, to him many a writer has proved himself a comic genius in narrative and risen no higher than farce in drama; e.g., Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* vs. *She Stoops to Conquer*. Meredith, then, while elevating and honoring the Comic Muse, honors a lady of very select tastes.

Of comic creeds these are the chief. In the light of these can we present a case for Plautus?

Let us review in brief these theories as stated, to discover their limitations. The theory of laughter as a form of degradation in the object laughed at, practically limits comedy to the field of satire. In satire there is ridicule divorced from kindness, "hard hitting" usually with a moral purpose in view. Applied to the motives of an Aristophanes or a Shaw, the theory is complete.

In any other form of the comic the theory does not apply. Surely there is no maliciousness in Shakespeare's treatment of the characters in his romantic comedies, those creatures of the "woods and wilds"; he is sympathetic even in his pictures of the "worldly," e.g., Falstaff or Katherine the Shrew. There is no more intent here to degrade or moralize or correct than there is in the rollicking fun of a Plautus. As for Plautus we feel that he identifies himself

with his rogues; he breathes the same air at the same level; he is a joyous participant, not a lofty observer.

Outside the field of character the theory applies not at all. A witty retort, a good pun, a skilful turning of words so as to give a new and startling meaning, does not move the muscles of laughter by a perception of degradation in language. Or in situations —Sosia 2, the servant, meets Sosia 2 (Mercury disguised) and is confounded by his second self. Surely as regards the juxtaposition of the situation, our laughter is not in superior delight.

Lastly, this theory would class all laughter as a mediate result dependent upon a prior evaluation. Without this prior perception, the necessary inferiority could not be established. That laughter is always a mediate process, can well be doubted; more often it is an immediate reaction unexpected and startling to the laugher as well as the laughee.

Laughter, a form of the intellect as Kant would have it, calls for an even greater ponderosity of thought. We may well doubt if men come to the theater weighted down intellectually. For an esoteric group who enjoy "closet drama" (*bon à mettre au cabinet*) rather than the stuff acted out, let laughter mentally digested be the portion. But surely the sudden laugh of exuberance, a reflex as it were, is no less noble a thing than the reflective smile. Men need not be ashamed of their reflex actions.

So this theory divorces comedy from the stage—an impossibility on the face of it—and takes no account of the greater portion of men's cachinnation—sudden laughter which is felt not analyzed, an immediate, not a mediate thing, as Schopenhauer would have it.

Bergson's social significance of laughter is being more and more appreciated. His mainstay is that the ridiculous is present where the automatic is foisted upon life. We have small difficulty in finding stiff mechanical effects which amuse us in gestures, situations, and character. His theory applies at once to the rigid virtues and vices, to minds possessed of an *idée fixe*, for instance, Tartuffe's blind hypocrisy, Uncle Toby's innocence, the self-worship of Willoughby Patterne, the avarice of Euclio. And many examples of *raideur* may be found in situations and words. But the most surprising thing is that Bergson never refers to a

complementary group of facts, instances of excessive spontaneity and freedom of movement where we cannot look for repression and mechanical uniformity. Many-sidedness and exuberance are surely as comical as the lack of a sign of full play on life may be in other circumstances. Falstaff is more than a liar; he is a coward and a buffoon. Plautus' slaves are comic but of the prancing, dancing, variable type. Willamant is a lady of dignity and a tease withal, changeable as a weather-cock. And hosts of men and women have walked the comic stage in complex and varied garb, exuberant and flexible in their individuality, not rigid in type form.

Meredith adapts a definite theory to definite facts; but his theory is very limited as his facts are. The doors of his comic mansion are closed and bolted to the vast number who in the past centuries have aroused men's laughter. Pitifully few are the geniuses who hold the key which permits them to pass the gates into the *Comicum Comicorum*. We may indeed be grateful to Meredith for his high conception of the comic. He honors the muse of comedy as she has never been honored before; but to make her such an exalted lady is to invest her with something of tragic awfulness. She is not free and easy; she does not mingle with all mankind, only with the few of intellectual laughter. She seeks the delight which in Sidney's mind was nobler than laughter. Her coterie is small; there is no freemasonry, no widespread democracy in her kingdom of laughter. It cannot but be remarked that of the four whom Meredith ranks as chief among comic dramatists two failed of an audience for their plays, while Aristophanes, Shakespeare, and Plautus, who are disconcerted, had an immediate public. There is surely some warrant for saying that if these plays are outside comic rules and yet have pleased to furnish lasting food for laughter, the comic rules may be at fault rather than the plays: *Non sequitur*.

No human faculty is really accounted for when various stages of theory development have been pointed out. It is not the intention here to piece together a Plautine theory from a study of his plays. Or to establish any other creed. It is doubtful if a comprehensive and adequate theory of the comic would help the

enjoyment of the ludicrous. Men may live by rule; but they will not learn to laugh by rule. The comic is in its way like a beautiful statue or a piece of music; a matter not to reason about but to recognize. It calls for an almost juvenile acceptance, not for a mature discrimination.

There is a quality in laughter which we must recognize as essential and worthy if we seek to understand the laughter of a Plautus; it seems that this is the important element which has been omitted in these theories. It is the element of child's play. If in any essential the child is father to the man, it lies in the fact of human laughter. A child is naturally gay; the seriousness of life has not chained his risible faculties. None of your learned men make mention of this laughter which is but the calling out of this child nature within us, the play instinct; it eschews deep thought, insists on being carefree, rippling, exuberant. There is the intellectual smile, the seriousness of delight, the reasoned laughter, but these smack of the "grown-up." Impulsive mirth is juvenile. In the wit and humor of life, the give and take of repartee, comes the hearty and sudden rebound which is the saving childishness of maturer years. This, I take it, is the essential nature of Plautus' comic genius. And in this he was one with the men of his time. Like Shakespeare he was the unconscious artist, careless of posterity's comment:

Does mad and fantastic execution,
With such a careless force and forceless care.

He lived whole-souled with his generation. Moreover, to say that Plautus wrote simply for box receipts is not to recognize the distinct unity between the playwright and his audience. Ben Jonson recognizes this:

From Flaccus' censure you have set him free,
Kindly reversing the unjust decree,
What Horace blamed, the world by you is taught
T' have been the age's not the author's fault.

Plautus accepts this oneness with his public; he does not place any blame for his work upon any depravity in the public taste

as did Lope de Vega who frankly stooped to please and that for gold merely:

. . . . for since the public pay,
'Tis just, methinks, I by their compass steer,
And write the nonsense that they love to hear.

In Plautus' case we have a playwright and a public in a childishly carefree, happy mood, finding in everything grist for its "mill of laughter." There had been moral depression, economic stringency, dread, and fear while Hannibal stalked through Italy or threatened in Africa. Now Rome was established supreme. In psychic reaction, the populace flocked to the theater then as in current post-bellum times. Nor was the laughter a whit acidulated, whether from patrician or plebeian diaphragm. Plautus appealed to a unified populace; for there was not yet between the mass of the people and the *literati* the gap which we find in Terence's day.

Having now shown the honorable essence of Plautine laughter, what in particular can we say of the methods he employed? Return we to Meredith's marking system. Premising Meredith's dual classification, we acknowledge that Plautus is not in the 100 per cent group; but we refuse to class him in any zero group. Failure in one capacity is often but the symbol of genius in another direction.

Plautus wrote no comedies of this "high" type; but he did write one romantic comedy and for the rest ingenious and sparkling farces with here and there a touch of "high" comedy. This statement is made under the limiting definition whereby comedy "consists of an action caused by the conflict of character with character, the characters conditioning the action; farce is an action which conditions the characters and forces them to fit as best they can into the prescribed situations."

But to separate forms in this way is really to dogmatize as much as the eighteenth-century critics who classified comedies into those of incident, manners, and character. These three ingredients are in every comedy though in varying degree. In like manner the lines cannot be drawn hard and fast between pure comedy and farce; in many a play we have, say, comedy in scene 1,

farce in scenes 2 and 3, comedy and farce in scene 4, etc. Farce has not only proved for comic writers an inevitable form but by the test of time acceptable, for according to the definition above many of the world's masterpieces of comic literature are farces. To name a few: Molière, *Les Précieuses ridicules*, *Le Malade Imaginaire*; Beaumarchais, *Barbier de Séville*; Shakespeare, *Comedy of Errors*, *Taming of the Shrew*; Goldsmith, *She Stoops to Conquer*. Those who look askance at a form of art with such an illustrious history, need to free their systems of the last remnants of Aristotelian scorn. Plautus had no fastidious and highly artificial restriction on laughter; like his brother actors, Molière and Shakespeare, he knew that the hypothesis of drama is pantomime, that action is the elemental source of mirth. Rarely does his farce descend to outright burlesque—in some scenes of the *Amphitruo* and the *Mostellaria*. Yet for the most his plots (except the *Captivi*) are purely incidental.

In passing, it is well to define the reference to his romantic comedy. Romantic comedy as such is not a distinct literary genre. It receives no recognition from Meredith beyond the statement that it is "a special study in the poetically comic." It is a form employed by Shakespeare in his *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Tempest*, *Winter's Tale*; by Plautus in the *Rudens*. The setting is removed from the workaday world to scenes distinct by all of nature's world of the woods and the sea. Here we have the "rosy warmth of Romance, moods of poetry and dream delight." The characters are more distinctly representatives of humanity than the usual comic types fitting into workings of everyday society; this "rosy warmth" in which the characters move diffuses over the comic possibilities which the characters would have if viewed in a purely objective attitude of amused observation. The *Rudens* reveals the touch of nature poetry in Plautus. The prologue is by the God Arcturus; the actors are fishermen; there are varied and picturesque descriptions of storms and rescues. Add to this artistic background the dream motif and here is one of his most attractive plays. But even here the lively situations are the stuff of which the play is woven: *iuvénis* vs. *leno*, the quarrels of the slaves, the beatings. Plautus the play producer,

like the short-story writer of today, knows his bag of tricks. But what writer is not in secret conspiracy against his audience?

Plautus has, then, this boundless resource in varied action. And yet the creatures of his genius are not mere puppets in the situation. Where we dissociate development of character from the fabric of the action we find the characters distinct as types, sometimes distinct as individuals. It has been left for Molière to develop the "comedy of character" in the highest form, i.e., the revelation of character carries the play; action is not dominant.

Where we get individuals in Plautus, he leans almost to caricature though without a shred of malice. This gives his creatures more distinctiveness than Terence's. Yet his Euclio is no more overdrawn than Molière's Harpagon. And where in the range of comedy can we find a better psychological analysis than that of the old man Euclio? The physician in the *Menaechmi* is surely drawn from life. The hag Scapha¹ is an individual. Plautus has more than a cabinet of wax figures.

With the moral qualities of his creatures we have not to deal. They have no moral substance; neither have they an immoral substance; like their creator they are amoral. Plautus like Bergson has a social not a moral point of view. Yet he steers clear of evaluation of action in the field of the social; his art impulse restrains him from more than an aesthetic contemplation. In fact, here comes a sense of escape from the rules we know cannot be set aside in the world of reality. On the whole his is a playful attitude, the absence of serious thought in a holiday mind, an appeal to laughter—child laughter. Plautus will not have comedy a moral purgative, Congreve with his *castigat ridendo*, the nun Hrotwitha, Macaulay, Steele, and a host of others contrary notwithstanding. In his characters the "elements are so mixed" as to render absurd a view of such as Steele's "faultily faultless" or disgustingly bad; his is no sentimental comedy perverting all the ordinances of nature for a grain of poetical justice. Like Hazlitt, Plautus kept distinct the functions of the pulpit and the stage; unlike the modern drama of ideas he has no desire to inform or teach. He is the arch-heretic of the didactic heresy. One of his

¹ *Mostellaria*.

characters is his mouthpiece: "At times I've seen the comedian when acting repeat sayings in a wise manner and be applauded for them . . . but when each person went thence his own way home there wasn't one after the fashion which they had recommended." If he feels himself growing sententious, he checkmates with a "sed iam satis est philosophatum." So although the public is laughed at to its face, it is not as Shaftesbury says in his essay "reprehended for its follies so as to make it think itself contemned." No Pharisaism corrupts the artist in him by utter disgust or contempt for vice.

We must approach Plautus as Lamb did the Restoration comedy—refuse for the moment to take serious views. The figures that walk the stage are subjects neither of approval or disapproval but of temporary acceptance. Said Lamb, "These creatures do not offend my moral sense; in fact they do not appeal to it at all." Yet Macaulay most solemnly undertook to refute Lamb.

Plautus laughed with and not at his characters; he was a true *syngelast*. Unlike Strindberg, he does not find the joy of life in "violent and cruel struggle." The fertility of the soul complex, the joy of ultimate analysis, food for the naturalists, did not trouble him. Perhaps, therefore, his plays will prove more "permanently pleasureable" than these. Yet spare him the lorgnette of a Macaulay or a Gossen or a Jeremy Collier.

A word about situation and language in his plays. With his basic purpose of *faire rire*, he is inventive to the extreme. In the *Mostellaria* scheme follows scheme beginning with a ghost story and ending with an exchange of real estate. The *Menaechmi* is a totality of comic situations. The *Euclo* is diverting in more than one place; most vivid the scene in which we see Euclio in argument with his slave, *chassé* back and forth in a mechanical way truly Bergsonian. Often the situation is mere wit-combat. For that Plautus falls back on the comic expressed by language, and that failing, on the comic created by it. "Words, words words"—almost logorrhea. "Inversion," "repetition," "reciprocal interference," were never so well defined as in the practice of this careless, heated artist. All too often these definitions are

wrenched to the grotesque; if we would have the grain we must take the chaff with it. Even so did the mighty Shakespeare, and was bid of Ben Jonson to revise. It would be interesting to compare MSS had some purist of Cicero's day re-written Plautus. Meters trimmed, characters whitewashed, barbarisms excerpted, local color restricted to Greece—no longer would there be "a Turk wearing the neckwear of a Christian and a Roman in tight breeches," as Lope de Vega remarked of the Spanish comedy of his day; no longer "explosive wit dropping its trains of many-colored fire"; blue-penciled "invitor . . . invitassitis," "Thalem . . . talento" and other instances of "false wit." Plautus in the original would have no better defense than such a chilled and labored reconstruction on the part of some Roman Bentley. He would need no essay of Lamb to defend his puns, either those of straight gait or those "defective in one leg." In fact, reconstruction, leading to reversion to type, might do him more justice than he deserves.

Sic Plautus. He laughed loudly but not in scorn. He laughed thoughtlessly but not so as to discredit the laughter of the intellect. His laughter was hearty, not a "whiffling husky cachinnation as thru wool," for he believed with Carlyle that "the man who cannot laugh is not only fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils; but his whole life is already a treason and a stratagem." Plautus gave society not a pedestal but a laugh at itself, the uncritical laughter of a child—*le secousse spasmodique*, which is ours when we seize the comic essence of life as it comes, directly and completely. If other reasons were as plenty as blackberries, this one would be sufficient to establish his comic genius. He made laughter a privilege and a delight; and so laid the chill ghost of Aristotle.

NIL SINE MAGNO VITA LABORE DEDIT MORTALIBUS

By J. O. LOFBERG
University of Texas

In a recent number of the *Journal* (XIV, 388) readers will find an interesting account of the building of a real *Pons in Rheno Factus* by a second-year high-school class. All who participated in the construction of this bridge will doubtless remember how they and Caesar did it, long after they forget where he was going and why. The achievement will certainly leave a less bitter taste in their mouths than the immortal Julius' ablative absolutes and subjunctives and will furnish material for anecdotes about their Latin course when the pupils are old and gray. More than that, this picnic excursion must have furnished pupils and teachers a better chance of getting acquainted than classroom routine ever could, and it is a pity that we cannot all of us achieve this earlier in the year than the date at which the famous chapter usually comes. With the desire to get acquainted and to create a live interest in a subject, whether it be Latin or woodcarving, no sensible person can have any quarrel, and least of all is there cause for quarrel in the spirit of this little incident. But in spite of this the reading of the article has opened up an old sore that irritates me so much now that I cannot avoid crying out to the world about it.

To begin in Socratic style: We admit, do we not, that, of the many things in the world, some are worth our special interest and some are not? If the *Pons in Rheno Factus* belongs to those that are worth our special interest, why does it? Are the beams, piling, poles, and the method of getting them into shape the cause? To my way of thinking they are not. No one but an engineer or an antiquarian can have much abiding curiosity about that. And yet how heavy upon us is the spell of that bridge! No high school is complete now unless it has one or two miniature

replicas of it. My own pupils once tried their hands at the construction of one or more of them the same year in which they presented me with lifelike reproductions in potato and toothpick of the jointless elks in Caesar's zoo. One of my colleagues once offered her class the chance to escape the spring term examination by constructing bridges instead, and my memory is that fewer than the bridge-devotees would imagine took advantage of the opportunity. I have often wondered why the ability that both boys and girls, the country over, show in constructing these bridges is not held up to the manual-training people as proof of the practical value of the classics. However, it may be just as well as it is; they would probably prove that the dexterity was due to courses in whittling that the young people had had with them.

What is the real value of the bridge-chapter? My answer would be that, if the bridge is worth our crossing, it is because it is such an excellent concrete example of the Romans' determination to be superior to the difficulties that beset them, and I am under the impression that most of us lose sight of this in the usual maze of beams and piling. However, be the importance of the chapter what it may, it has certainly received more prominence than its Latinity or subject-matter deserves. But I am now in danger of committing the same mistake. The bridge party was surely harmless enough in itself and it merely scratched the scab of that old sore. What really laid bare the wound was the frank statement of the purpose of the party. It was planned in order "to give the freest rein to the play instinct and at the same time get the clearest possible idea" of how the bridge was built, in order that boys and girls "who like to play" might have their day. In fact, the concluding paragraph of the article calls on us Latin teachers to "make more effort to combine work and play in the mastery of difficult things" and so "beguile the young people by the spirit of play to undertake and perform formidable tasks." Of course this has a familiar ring. We have heard the theory expounded for some time and have seen it in practice, and I, for one, still believe it is the ruination and damnation of American education. To put it in colder form it amounts to saying: Work is and must be disagreeable. To get work done we must beguile the young person

into thinking that the work is not work but play. If a nation of thinkers and doers can be reared on such pap we old fogies must keep still and not spoil the success. But as yet some of us are unconvinced and unreconstructed. An extremely readable protest against the idea that a child works better if he is beguiled into thinking that work is play is found in *Harper's Magazine* for October, 1919. Teachers and principals, especially principals, will do well to read it. The writer, Wilson Follett, has proved beyond doubt that one child at least prefers to distinguish between work and play, and finds play more interesting when it comes as the reward of a piece of work completed. Surely our own experiences have shown us that this is no isolated case. But no matter whether this point be true or not, is it not our duty, as teachers, to encourage, or at least develop the work-instinct? Most of us grownups still need to encourage it in ourselves. When shall the young man or woman begin to realize that while there is play in the world there is also work, and that the harder he works the more he will enjoy play and that excess of play renders him less fit for work and less able to enjoy play? Must he wait until his school career is over? The criticism of the business world on our educational output seems to imply that the work instinct has suffered atrophy or has never been born.

The popularity of the play-instinct theory and the lagging interest in the classics have combined to rush us Latin teachers into an effort "to make it interesting," and while we were rushing we could not always take time to see just what our goal was. Will you think back with me over the efforts we have made and see whether they have been on a plane worthy of the dignity of our subject? To me there is something disappointing in the indecent abandon with which our classical world has endeavored to revive the flagging interest, even though our efforts have revealed Protean adaptability. My chagrin is the more deep when I confess that I am recalling *quae ipse miserrima vidi et quorum pars magna fui*. We have organized clubs, given plays in Latin and the vernacular, dramatized every conceivable episode in the authors read; we have entertained friend and foe at Roman dinners and reclined in unseemly angles in the frantic effort to imbibe the Roman

atmosphere; we have draped helpless young people in togas "made by themselves" (another proof of the practical value of the classics!); we have organized Roman states and with more zeal than accuracy learned all about Roman politics and government; we have dressed dolls in Roman garments and in the peaceful atmosphere of the classroom we have played a quiet social game of cards with nothing at stake except the principal parts of verbs; we have even played games in "pinning armor on a Roman soldier, blindfolded." "Handsome, slender youths (I am quoting from the printed word) draped in cheesecloth, with graceful rhythmic motion have paced the green, as *tibicines*, while the weird note of the *tibia* was made on a violin by a boy secreted in a clump of shubbery"; pupils have been "delighted to grunt as pigs" (in Latin apparently, though the pigs belonged to Circe); victrolas hidden in more shrubbery have substituted for *femina nunc cantat*; lines have been so well spoken "that young children of the neighborhood repeated for days afterward Latin phrases, accurately and distinctly"; other actors have read their lines so successfully that "even spectators who knew little Latin could catch enough of the jokes to enjoy the occasion" (this of course by those trained by the direct method).

Interest has certainly been created, and some of us have really felt that it was an abiding interest that would save the day for the classics. Others of us are less sanguine, perhaps because we lack the spontaneity essential to make these side shows a success. To those who feel satisfied with the results I have nothing to say, but it has occurred to me that many a young, conscientious teacher has become discouraged because she has no particular theatrical ability, no dramatic talent, no aptitude for card-playing, no taste or knack for costume-making or bridge-building, and as a result has come to regard herself a "useless burden to the soil." Perhaps such a one may gather a little comfort from hearing somebody once, just once, confess himself skeptical about the value of the "stunts" we have attempted outside of class, and extremely weary of this effort to be entertaining.

To borrow the phraseology of a famous educator and statesman, have we not been encouraging the side shows to the neglect

of the circus? It is certainly true that the circus proper has often lacked interest and something should be done to enliven it, but my contention is that the circus should be improved and the side shows dropped—unless we can show that the side show is really an integral part of the circus.

Interest in the classics is lagging; in fact, interest in any sort of study that requires careful application with no promise of financial reward is lagging. Perhaps we are unwise to be kicking against the pricks. And still some of us will continue to do so until we have a Pauline vision. The problem then is to make our kicks most effective. Can this be done by side shows and free rein for the play-instinct? I cannot believe it. The only thing that will develop abiding interest in a subject is the conviction on the part of the pupil that he is "getting on," and to "get on" in Latin he must feel that he is mastering vocabulary and idiom and developing a moderate ability to understand what he is reading without inseparable contact with lexicon, notes, and—ponies. If this can be accomplished there will be plenty of opportunity to introduce him to the rich by-products of his classical course: a decent grasp of his own language and its literature, an understanding of ancient public and private life, an appreciation for style in art and literature, and other more intangible things. Need this be dull and uninteresting, and can it be done by the average teacher in the circus proper? It can, if we are willing to begin early and recognize that it cannot be done at once, and that it will offer little opportunity for competing with more spectacular efforts in other departments.

Interest on the part of the pupils in the literary side of what they read will perhaps be very slow in appearing. The modern world will have none of that except by compulsion. But it has been my experience that there are other things that the average pupil finds surprisingly interesting.

One of these is the study of mottoes and proverbial expressions. Few can be extracted from the Gallic War and the War on Catiline but collections of them are not hard to find. (Some beginners' books have fairly representative lists.) Most teachers will prefer to browse around in Latin literature and hunt for them. Not only Virgil but even Horace and Terence contain many a one which fits

the immature pupils' vocabulary and Latin experience. A play of Terence will furnish enough for sight reading for many a day. Year after year I have had the pleasure of introducing pupils to the motto of the United States. The general impression seems to be that *E Pluribus Unum*, since it appears on dollars means "one of several" and carries with it the comforting thought that there are more where this one comes from. Even college classes are surprisingly uninformed as to its meaning.

It is an unusual class indeed that does not enjoy memorizing, *fortis fortuna adiuval; unum cum noris, omnis noris; quot homines, tot sententiae; quod fors feret seremus aequo animo; quid verbis opus est; cantilenam eandem canis; dictum sapienti sat est; senectus ipsas morbus; satis est suum officium facere; modo liceat vivere, est spes; mala mens, malus animus*—but the list is endless. We forget in our supersophistication that what is so old and almost trite to us is even fresh and interesting to the younger generation. And not only is their interest aroused; they learn in this way vocabulary, forms, syntax, and idiom that can be mastered in no easier way and at the same time come into touch with the eternally human element of the classical world.

Curiously enough the moralizing tone of much in the comedy that is quotable, in Horace and other writers has a peculiar appeal. The longer passages of this nature, written on the board, serve as excellent sight reading. Even Martial and Juvenal supply material that the wise teacher can edit successfully for high-school Seniors and Juniors. No great command of Latin is necessary to read, in this way, for example, Martial's idea of what makes *vitam beatiorem* (x. 47).

Roman life becomes more real if the pupil makes only a blundering rendering of Martial's Roman Day (iv. 8); more real, I suspect, than any toga "made by himself" ever would. He will undoubtedly feel very closely kin to the Roman boys if he but hears of Horace's famous *Orbilius plagosus* and Martial's *ludi magister*, who is so aptly described as *scelerate, invisum pueris virginibusque caput. Ludi magister parce simplici turbae* becomes a favorite quotation.

Another thing that the average pupil enjoys is anecdote, and surely there is nothing better suited to give a picture of Greek and Roman life. Cicero's works, especially the philosophical, teem

with them. Even a few months in Latin will be enough preparation for reading, at sight, some of these. Second-year people seem to find unusual interest in the story of Ennius and Nasica exchanging calls, and in the discovery that even in Rome "not at home" was as white a lie as it is with us. The teacher who wishes an excellent collection of some readable anecdotes can find them in Walford's *Extracts from Cicero* (Oxford Press). Many of these are too hard for the young pupil to attempt, and every teacher must be the judge of what will be practicable for her own classes.

No one in his right mind assumes that all this can be done by every teacher with every class, every year, or that it need be done. But certainly the teacher who will give it a trial in the classes from which she thinks there is some hope of response will get results that will amaze and satisfy. The study of such bits as these will do for the pupil what we really want done; he will gain some idea of what the Romans were like, how they talked, what they thought and why they acted as they did, and he will be getting it largely by his own efforts and feel that his course is successful. What seems to me one of the most beneficial things about it all is that it gives the young pupil something to think about besides the concrete things, bridges, weapons, walls, camps, togas, etc., and will make it possible for him to understand a few abstractions. A painful and recent experience has impressed on my mind the absolute inability of the average student, even in college, to grasp abstractions. A Sophomore girl recently was expounding in her own words what Cicero has to say about the advisability of discarding an old friend for a new. Although she insisted before she began that it was perfectly clear to her, it was quite obviously a jumble of "old friends, old and new horses and familiar scenery," and she wound up by announcing to the class that the conclusion was that "we can all of us love scenery as well as animals." Truly ideas are hard to see and togas and bridges much easier!

The reader may possibly feel that even a small amount of this sort of thing will confuse the circus proper and that what I suggest will bring the side show and the circus under the same tent and spoil both of them. Only a fair trial of the suggestions will decide that question. My hope is that even if it does cause some con-

fusion, the side show that I advocate *is* a part of the circus and is worth attending, in and of itself. But whatever objections may be raised to the preceding, there can be no similar charge brought against what follows.

Nearly every class will be found to have a surprising interest in words, just words. There are quite naturally a few who prefer to take words as they are, ignore any effort at study of changes in the spelling of root words, in the effect of suffixes and prefixes, and who object to carrying the words back to "Adam and Eve." But such are the exception. The majority will see at once the "practical" value of doing this sort of thing. And when I learn from my classes that "inappropriate" is derived from *in- ad- propius* and means "to approach into" or that to "take something not your own is to inappropriate it"; that "querulous" comes from *quaero* and "is applied to one who questions, likes to inquire into everything, leads to the idea of doubting and instability," I am convinced that there is practical value in the study of words. Truly it is a disgrace to our schools to turn out people who admit that they have no idea whatever about the meaning of autonomous, who define anarchy "as something like what the emperor of Germany was," and nativity as "having something to do with patriotism"—and we do it, even now. Of course all misunderstood words are not of Latin origin, and the Latin teacher is not responsible for what teachers in other departments leave undone. And yet the Latin teacher can help to fix the habit of trying to understand the meaning of words so firmly that the pupil will be dissatisfied with superficial and hazardous guesses.

But apart from this form of practical value in the study of words there is another very practical one that the pupil soon begins to recognize. After a few days of study of prefixes, suffixes, root words, peculiar changes in the spelling of roots, he finds that he is not thumbing his lexicon nearly so much as before. The pupil who can tell at a glance the difference between *incidit*, and *incidit*, *accidit* and *accedit* (there are not many even in these ideally conducted classes) will not long be blind to the fact that the study of words is a time-saver. Why do we have continual and persistent mistranslation of *vires* and *viri*; *opus*, *opera*, *opes*; *deligo*,

diligo; certis and ceteris; constitit and constituit; moriri and morari; and so on without end? Because we have allowed the pupils to think that half a look was better than one good one. Nothing but continual insistence on careful reading and repeated effort on the part of the teacher to drive the distinctions home will change the situation. The reason why my own classes still confuse ordinary words, do not recognize fundamental roots or the effect of a certain prefix, is that I have not taken the time to make them see that this is all-important and economical of time. And the best way to do this is to drill on these things a few minutes every day so that the meaning of a word or a prefix is as clear as it can be apart from the context.

And last but not least—idioms. Is there a class in America that does not waste valuable time in thumbing the lexicon and soiling the notes in search for suitable translations for those oft-recurring combinations of words that we call idioms? What class will approach even such combinations as *nihil aliud nisi, quin etiam, plurimum valet, nescio quo modo, optimus quisque*, without hesitation? Both Caesar and Cicero, in the works usually read in high school, are full of idiomatic turns that the young people enjoy learning when their attention is once called to them. They like to turn respectable English into “absurd” Latin equivalents and feel that they are getting on—and they are. Anybody who can give the idiomatic Latin for “somebody or other came in; it happened that; add to this the fact that; what’s the reason why; what in the world did you say,” etc., has “got on” very well and is getting such evident enjoyment out of the work that bridge parties, sewing bees, and dialogues will not be needed, and more than that, the “Great God Jargon” will have lost several votaries (*Classical Journal*, XV, 244). And most important of all, the teacher is also getting on. Think of the time that she (may we see the day when *he* will not be out of place!) may devote to *learning Latin*, to browsing around in works that she will otherwise leave entirely alone because of the inertia from which we all suffer, or because she is worn out by engineering some other sort of side show.

There is certainly nothing original about any of these suggestions, and my only reason for presuming to bore you with them

is to convince both you and myself that they are worth trying and trying again, to judge from the very obvious results that even faulty efforts have had. At any rate trying them will give absolutely no encouragement to the "play-instinct" in either pupil or teacher, and that after all is the important thing. Some of us are convinced that Mr. Wilson Follett is right in his conclusion: "Whenever we have failed temporarily with Barbara we have always discovered in the end that it was because we had asked too little to interest her, not too much for her to accomplish." And Barbara is a girl "who likes to play"!

Nil sine magno
Vita labore dedit mortalibus.

CICERO AND THE AGRARIAN PROPOSALS OF 63 B.C.¹

BY EVAN T. SAGE
University of Pittsburgh

In some ways the hardest and most important task of the Latin teacher is to make his students realize that Latin is something more than a series of disconnected units of twenty or thirty lines each, and that in the works of Caesar and Cicero we have historical documents that tell an important, and even an interesting, story. It is difficult for teacher and student alike to see that in the Catilinarian affair we have something more than the attempt of a bloodthirsty scoundrel to rid himself of his personal enemies and make himself master of Rome. Yet the conspiracy was merely one of a series of efforts to better the condition of the Roman and Italian poor. There is something to be said in explanation, if not in defense, of Catiline. He had a definite and comprehensible plan of economic reform, which perhaps no one else did, and the abuses he wished to correct were genuine and serious. In a way, he was the successor of the Gracchi and the precursor of Caesar, and his nearest relative, spiritually speaking, was Sertorius. Do not think that I am trying to remove, by whitewash or otherwise, the black spots on Catiline's character. He was bad enough at best, and with his methods in the fall of 63 we can have no sympathy. But we may at least admit the possibility that it was defeat after defeat that drove Catiline to desperation, until violence became the only method he could see to use. Viewed in this way, the conspiracy becomes merely one phase of a long struggle between parties in Rome, the parties, unfortunately, being always more or less closely identified with an individual. Another phase of this struggle, belonging to the same year, was the

¹ Read at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South at Cleveland, April 1, 1920.

agrarian proposal of Rullus, with which I wish to deal at this time.

From the beginning of the Roman Republic, agrarian laws had been a recognized means of playing politics. Plebeian and later democratic leaders had sought votes by agrarian proposals, though the abuses they were trying to remedy were real enough. The mixture of political and economic measures in the Licinian Laws, the use of an agrarian law by the younger Gracchus to establish his own power, the charge brought against Caesar that an agrarian proposal was more worthy of a tribune than a consul, all show the political character of such legislation. It is no wonder that the senatorial party was suspicious of any agrarian law. The proposal with which I shall deal was unquestionably of this sort, designed quite as much to embarrass the opposition as to correct economic injustices. The bill was introduced by the tribune Rullus, though it is generally believed that the real author was Caesar. This is probable enough. The year 63 was marked by a series of attacks on the senatorial party, all displaying certain common characteristics in the midst of variety, and all, in my opinion, designed to annoy the nobiles and perhaps especially their new spokesman Cicero. To understand this statement we must review Cicero's political career.

I cannot agree with scholars like Tyrrell and Purser, who assert that Cicero was a consistent conservative throughout his career. The presentation of all the evidence would take too long now, but the following arguments lead me to the belief that down to the year 64 Cicero was a democrat, though of the more moderate sort, as one would expect from his equestrian associations and his own temperament: (1) In 65 Cicero expected the nobiles to oppose him (*Att. i. 2. 2*). (2) The author of the *Commentariolum Petitionis*, attributed to Q. Cicero, is sure that the senators will be unfriendly (iv. 14, etc.). (If this were a genuine work of Q. Cicero, its testimony would be almost conclusive; if the work of some later rhetorical student, its value would be dependent on the date and sources of the work.) (3) Sallust says that the senatorial party supported Cicero for the consulship solely to avoid something worse (*Cat. 23*). Against such testimony Cicero's

rhetorical exhortations to himself in later works like the poem *de consulatu suo* cannot stand. At that time Cicero wanted people to believe that he had always been a senatorial.

It is clear from Asconius' argument to the oration *in toga candida* that of the seven candidates for the consulship in 64 only three were seriously to be considered—Catiline, Antonius, and Cicero, of whom the first two had formed a *coitio*. The important thing, from the senatorial viewpoint, was to beat Catiline. This could be done only by waiving Cicero's *novitas* and electing him, as he could count on strong support from the other orders, and no genuine senatorial candidate had a chance of success. In this way the situation resembles somewhat the presidential campaign of 1912. Many Republicans, believing that a vote for Mr. Taft was a vote thrown away, seem to have supported Mr. Wilson, to insure Mr. Roosevelt's defeat. We cannot trace the progress of the campaign of 64. The few fragments of Cicero's speech *in toga candida*, with the comments of Asconius, are just enough to be tantalizing. Just when it became known that Cicero in his consulship would act with the senatorial party, we cannot tell. Certainly it was not later than January 1, as will be seen. It is quite possible that the defection of Cicero was one reason for the vigor and variety of the attacks made by the democrats in his year. The old weapon—an agrarian law—was now supplemented by a law giving certain special privileges to Pompey, a proposal to restore to full rights the children of Sulla's victims, a change in the method of electing the pontifex maximus, resulting in Caesar's election to that office, and the challenge to the senate in the trial of Rabirius.

We are now in a position to examine the proposals of Rullus, which I wish to examine without reference to the discussions of later historians. We should bear in mind that this was one of the weapons in use in 63 against the nobiles and their new champion, and that the final attempt to annoy them was the conspiracy of Catiline, though more than mere annoyance was then intended. It is, then, the popular character of the bill that makes Cicero insist on *consul vere popularis*, the phrase with which he tries to describe himself, and perhaps to disguise his political change of base.

I cannot do better than to give Cicero's own account of the law (*De lege agr.* ii. 10 ff.):

To agrarian laws per se I have no objection, nor am I one of those who think it wrong to praise the Gracchi, who were men of the greatest fame, ability, and patriotism. So when I learned that the tribunes-elect were working on a new agrarian law, I went to them and offered to help them, realizing that as we were to be magistrates together it would be better to be on friendly terms. This well-meant offer was rejected, and it was plain that Rullus intended to use his power to harm the state. He held his first *contio*—no word about the bill. He held another *contio* and made a speech, with which only one fault could be found, that no one could tell what he said. Finally the bill was read. My shorthand writers took it down and gave me a copy. I read it through from beginning to end, with no hostility to the tribunate, and with no thought save for the public good. In the bill I found nothing but the attempt to set up ten kings.

As the tribunes were inaugurated on December 10, the bill was probably read in late December. Cicero made his first speech against it in the senate on January 1; and soon after, the second and third to the people. A fourth oration is lost. The first is incompletely preserved, but differs from the second mainly in the way one would expect from the difference in audience. His promise in the last sentence is particularly interesting:

Quodsi vos vestrum studium, patres conscripti, ad communem dignitatem defendendam profitemini, perficiam profecto, id quod maxime res publica desiderat, ut huius ordinis auctoritas, quae apud maiores nostros fuit, eadem nunc longo intervallo rei publicae restituta esse videatur.

Interesting, too, is his defiance of the tribunes and his consequent renunciation of a province.

As the second oration is more complete, I shall follow the analysis of the bill there given, but with a minimum of detail. The bill provided for the formation of a commission of ten, to be chosen by seventeen of the thirty-five tribes, these to be selected by lot by Rullus. Thus nine tribes could elect, even though their choice be unacceptable to the majority. A personal *professio* was required (this practically excluded Pompey). The decemviral power was to be confirmed by a *lex curiata*, but would not be impaired if the law were not passed. The normal procedure at an election seems to have been this: The choice was made by the *comitia tributa* or *centuriata*, and ratified by the *comitia curiata*, represented by thirty lictors, as their action was purely formal. This formality,

however, was necessary. (Into the complicated constitutional question here involved I cannot go now.) Yet Rullus arranged that the commissioners, chosen in this irregular way, be legitimized by the passage of the *lex curiata*, which they did not need to hold their power. The term of office was five years, the decemvirs were not removable, accountable, or subject to tribunical veto. They could establish new colonies and dispose of all property that had become public since the year 88 (this also seemed to be directed at Pompey). Cicero's comment on the proposal to drain off part of the city mob to colonies is illuminating as an anticipation of *panem et circenses* and a cause of the miserable conditions reflected in such documents as the Theodosian Code:

Vos vero, Quirites, si me audire vultis, retinete istam possessionem gratiae, libertatis, suffragiorum, dignitatis, urbis, fori, ludorum, festorum dierum, ceterorum omnium commodorum, nisi forte mavultis relictis his rebus atque hac luce rei publicae in Sipontina siccitate aut in Salpinorum pestilentiae finibus Rullo duce collocari.¹

Such in brief was the bill of Rullus. In place of this, Cicero promised the people *pax*, *tranquillitas*, *otium*, and thus to be a *consul popularis*, not in the sense that he was a member of that political party, but in the truer sense of one devoted to the public good (cf. the same play on the word in *In Cat.* iv. 9). Cicero's argument prevailed, and in the face of a threatened veto the bill was dropped. As Pliny the Elder said, "The people gave up to Cicero the agrarian law, that is, their own bread" (*N.H.* vii. 116).

Some further commentary is needed on certain points. The bill contains a curious mixture of politics and statesmanship. The proposal to draw off part of the idle and vicious mob was wise; Caesar revived it after he became dictator. Cicero's answer, quoted above, reveals the politician if not the demagogue. His threat of ten kings is also pure political buncombe. On the other hand, the method of choosing the commissioners looks like a deliberate attempt to fix the election. It had a certain sort of precedent, however, and was revived later in the year to insure the election of Caesar as *pontifex maximus*. The extravagance and elaborate ceremonial of the method of election remind us of the trial of Rabirius a little later. We observe the same revival of an antiquated procedure, the same excessively ostentatious dis-

¹ Section 71.

play of serious intent, and the same suspiciously ready acquiescence in defeat. I have expressed elsewhere¹ my belief that the trial of Rabirius was a carefully stage-managed performance, in which the accomplishment of the apparent purpose was not really seriously desired. The same thing seems to be true here, though the purpose was different. The bill of Rullus was not expected to pass in the form in which it was offered, though, if it did pass, well and good. Neither was it expected that Rabirius would be convicted, though, if it did turn out so, little harm would be done.

The purpose of the Rullan bill was to offer Cicero a chance to relieve discontent and improve economic conditions, but to offer it in a form that would provoke attack. Thus the unwillingness of Cicero and the senatorial party to do anything for the poor would be emphasized. It is quite possible that one of the arguments used by Catiline in the campaign of 63 was the refusal of the senate to do anything to relieve the poor. Certainly he did use it after the election (cf. his letter to Catulus in Sall. *Cat.* 35). The extraordinary powers to be given the commission, the virtual exclusion of the popular idol Pompey, the unusual method of choosing the decemvirs, were planned to attract attention and guarantee attack. Caesar's failure to follow up the agrarian law and the prosecution of Rabirius shows that he was not serious. He was in the matter of the election to the pontificate, but there is nothing in the tradition to suggest that exile was the only possibility for Caesar if the people failed to crucify Rabirius.

Let me emphasize my belief that it made little difference to Caesar whether Rullus passed his bill or not. The secondary purpose of the measure had been attained: life had been made additionally miserable for Cicero and his party. If Caesar had really wished to rise to supreme power by way of an agrarian commission, the methods used to get the commission created would undoubtedly have been far more subtle than those employed by Rullus. In modern slang, these latter were "coarse work," and Caesar could be "smooth" enough when he wished to be. Strategy teaches us that we should adopt every device to draw the enemy's fire and compel him to reveal his position and his strength. The Rullan bill, like the other anti-senatorial measures of the year, was of the

¹ "The *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*," C. W., XIII, 185 ff.

nature of reconnaissance and not of attack. We can hardly say, then, that the defeat of the Rullan bill was a serious setback for Caesar. It accomplished one of its purposes very well—the annoyance of the opposition. Cicero was forced into a position of apology and self-defense; his insistence on *consul popularis* is proof enough.

The episode showed, too, that the senate had no remedy for the economic distress and little real interest in it. After the failure of Rullus there was no hope for an agrarian law and that familiar form of relief. Rome knew one other method of getting relief, a cancellation or reduction of debts. Catiline now adopted this policy. It is doubtful whether Caesar and Crassus supported him, and Crassus at least could hardly have been very sympathetic. It was unfortunate that it was Catiline, with his unsavory record and his natural affinity for violence, who became the spokesman for the discontented, and that anarchy became the remedy they proposed. It was unfortunate that the radicals and not the moderates gained such an ascendancy in the democratic party at this time. It was unfortunate that there was no one but Catiline to offer relief, so that many good citizens supported him who could hardly have sincerely wished for anarchy (see especially Cicero's effort to win them away from Catiline in *In Cat.* ii. 17 ff.). The resemblance to conditions at the present time is too obvious to need comment. One of the factors in the spread of discontent was the defeat of the agrarian proposals, with the revelation of the attitude of the government and its insistence on senatorial supremacy, no matter what the cost.

The real significance, then, of the Rullan defeat is to be found, not in the disappointment of the author and his friends, but in the proof that it gave that the senate regarded it as purely political and not, in any way worthy of consideration, economic; that the senate could not be expected to do anything to relieve conditions, and had no program of economic reform. The success of the bill would have brought some relief, but its defeat prevented such a result. The bill accomplished its purpose of worrying the senate and of driving the party from one position to another equally hard to defend. The final result was that Catiline was driven into open rebellion, and for that no one was more to blame than the senatorial party itself.

SOME GREEK AND FRENCH PARALLELS¹

BY WALTER R. AGARD
Amherst College

In an incisive and stimulating paper² published a few years ago, John Jay Chapman called attention to the dangers of approaching Greek culture by means of German and English scholarship. While admitting the intelligence and sincerity of these scholars, he insisted that by race they were temperamentally unsympathetic, hence with regard to the lens which they have fashioned for our viewing the classics "we can never hope to get rid of all the distortions."

This appears to me a suggestive criticism. Is it not fair to assume that we may find the best interpretation of Greek material among scholars who are in temperament like the Greeks and live in a society of somewhat similar ideals and interests? If so, what society shall we choose? When I read Mr. Chapman's essay the impulse naturally came to consider the French. It seemed possible that their happy combination of Mediterranean character given fiber by northern blood might create an environment uniquely like that of Greece.

Since that time I have had a year's opportunity to verify the supposition, although not under wholly favorable conditions, it must be admitted. I have come to know ordinary people in many parts of France, the Berry land, Touraine, Burgundy, Paris, the Pyrenees. I have talked with university men and read with pedagogues. To some extent I have become acquainted with French attitudes. In so doing I have eagerly compared them with the Greek. My conclusion is that there are interesting and significant points of agreement, which mark the French as nearer akin to the ancient Greeks than other peoples seem to be. Some of these similarities I shall try to describe in this paper.

With such memories as the words of *βάρβαροι*, Pericles' Funeral Speech, and Socrates' patriotic avowal in the *Crito* in mind, I

¹ A paper read at the meeting of the Classical Association of New England, April 2, 1920.

² *Greek Genius*, chap. ii.

delighted in discovering among the French a similar charming provincialism. If Athens was proudly aware of her position as an example to all governments, did not Monsieur Lafille, my good friend of Charenton-du-Cher, solemnly affirm, "Il n'y a qu'une France!" To him, as to most Frenchmen, all other people were *oi βάρβαροι*. The Germans were brutish ones; the English rather selfish ones; we Americans, crude, big-acting ones. Only the Frenchmen possessed that combination of force and *finesse* which creates distinguished culture. "Yes, we have of course the most beautiful language," remarked a French lieutenant. To be sure; also the most charming countryside, the best manners, and Paris, home of art and ideas. "You soldiers are like your own band music, too much brass, lacking in nuance," I was told. France, needless to say, realizes that she possesses *nuance* and the other excellencies! Like old Greece, she is satisfied with her quality, and somewhat willingly relinquishes conquests of quantity to the modern Persians and Phoenicians; toward us she looks with wonder worthy of Herodotus, but hardly with the desire of imitation.

There is more to this, it appears, than a mere devotion to quality. As with the Greeks, there is actually a definite distrust of quantity. *μηδὲν ἄγαν*. The French people are scrupulously taught in moderation and self-limitation. I recall particularly the little farms, tenderly cared for from one generation to another, until they have become spiritual investments, beyond all trafficking. French habits of food are as incomprehensible to American appetites as those of Greece would be. *Potage au pain* is not to us a suitable *pièce de résistance* for dinner, yet it satisfies a Tours family as a cheese with bread and wine met the approval of Themistocles. In French industry there is a truly Dorian sense of thrift, far removed from any standards of Liverpool and Detroit. And French ideas, one may say, are also subjected to discipline; they are kept rigidly within the bounds of clarity and precision.

This is a distinction capable of broad implication; possibly, as Ferrero claims,¹ it is the most radical point of disagreement between northern and Mediterranean culture. At any rate, by virtue of having this attitude in common, France and Hellas establish spiritual relationship. There are three other points of

¹ *Europe's Fateful Hour*, chap. i.

similarity which I have observed: a sense of humor, intellectual curiosity, a conception of morality.

We have always thought of the French as conceited. But the final mark of conceit is not self-confidence or bravado; as Chesterton says, humility may by preference go clad in scarlet and gold. The condemnation lies in self-directed solemnity. The French are self-confident and gay of tongue; but they can smile at themselves with amazing ease. There is about them, even the peasants, much of a Socratic irony, which says unconsciously with Montaigne, "Le peste de l'homme, c'est l'opinion de savoir." *Drôle* and *curieux* are two of the Frenchman's most popular adjectives, and he applies them to himself as well as to others. In the severest struggle he is yet possessed of the gaiety and *élan* of youth. Gustave Hervé, in *La Victoire*, explained the sympathy between French and American soldiers on the ground that both were *bons enfants*. I was reminded of the words from the Timaeus: "Oh, Solon, Solon, you Greeks are always children. There is not an old man among the Greeks for you are all of you young in spirit."² Sometimes one finds cynicism, like that of the Anthology. "Ah, aveugle jeunesse, quand tu verras clair il te faudra des lunettes," I found cut in the stucco walls of a house in Savigny. But usually the sophistication is tempered and sensible, exposing petty prejudices as Molière did those of the learned ladies, who, you will remember, could not pardon the people's laughing without the permission of Aristotle! The Frenchman, smiling naïvely or with sophistication, is eager to take life like a game. Very surely this is sound Hellenic doctrine.

No part of the game appeals better to him than thinking and discussing those thoughts generously. It is not wholly the conclusions that matter, although I am sure much greater confidence is placed in ideas than with us. The fun is in the mental manipulation, the give and take of opinion. A score of times I have sat entranced in third-class railway apartments, listening to the vivid, rapier-slashes of words between chance acquaintances concerning the war, M. Clemenceau, the crop of cabbages, etiquette of loading parcels on compartment racks, personal affairs of great intimacy. I have not been limited to such insights. Provincial professors

² Tim. 22 A.

and Parisians show the same democracy of intellectual combative-ness and the same ardor in the word duel. No subjects, it seems, are taboo. A Frenchman is by no means content to know what you think about the weather. He is interested in hypocrisy in religion and the government, and in leagues of nations; and he will argue with animation on every matter, totally above any but transitory bitterness. We Americans are slower and more cautious in our subjects and treatment, more afraid of hurting personal feelings, more muddling and ponderous in our handling of ideas; but I could readily imagine such conversations in the Athenian agora at ten in the morning, where no subject was too sacred to be exposed to the attack of keen and supple minds, or any idea so inviolate that men would not pursue it to its logical conclusions.

I am treading on difficult ground when I attempt to identify Greek and French moral attitudes; and I can propose only some tentative conclusions.

One fact is sure: neither morality is by inheritance or immediate inclination our own. We are Anglo-Saxon, Hebraic, puritanical. Duty, which we rather take an austere pride in regarding as a stern daughter of the voice of God, is the foremost word in our moral code; and it usually means doing unattractive things because they are ordered by outward law or inward conscience. So we strive toward perfection by legislation; the Ten Commandments, Blackstone, and some Supreme Court give us laws rejoicing the heart. We like to know the things that ought not to be done; then, though they be ever so compelling, we shall be moral by not doing them.

If we are thus chiefly concerned about the sins of commission, I would say that French and Greek morality counsels against the sin of omission. We look at morality as inhibition; they regard it as liberation. "Thou shalt not" never caught the imagination of those versatile, restless Mediterranean and Gallic people.

What did catch their imagination as being the satisfying moral life? May I suggest an emphasis upon "justice" rather than on "duty"? Justice consists in being what is right, in harmony of spirit and inward poise, so that one's judgments and actions alike are marked by taste and reverence and serenity. Right living

thus becomes a natural product of intellectual and aesthetic content rather than of the will. So Aristotle, the most precise of Greek moralists, defined goodness as a balance in many qualities, which include courage, liberality, and wittiness as well as prudence and modesty. Socrates held that the love of beauty had ethical value. This same justice in the individual was projected to the state, which also became, not chiefly inhibitive, but liberating. "To the modern thinker," writes Mr. Ernest Barker, "the mission of the state is negative; its function is the removal of hindrances rather than the application of a stimulus to the moral life."¹ But the Greek state was under the obligation primarily to educate its citizens to that "independence of spirit, manysidedness of attainment and complete self-reliance in limb and brain"² of which Pericles justly boasted.

The general principle is, I think, professed also by the French. Moral living is measured, not in restriction but in expansion of powers. That negation is sin is part of their code. To do nothing is the worst evil. Not to love beautiful things; not to care for vigor and sincerity and courage—these defects in personality are the real flaws in men, the unforgivable sins. Because this *élan vital* does not find its expression in Woolworth buildings and Ford cars, we must not fall into the error of believing that France, mother-country of liberating ideas and emotions, "*passionnée des néauvetées et pour tout ce qui est beau*," is deficient in vitality; indeed, from my observation, I would say that in fineness and tenacity of grip on life the French are among the chosen people.

There is one final and inevitable comparison to be made: the reaction to war. So much has been written regarding the poilu that we ought to be able to block in a fairly complete picture of him: that bulkily equipped, blue-clad, pleasant-faced fellow, now yielding to sudden profound pessimism, now caught up in magnificent gusts of courage, yet at bottom steeped in stoicism; quick-witted, fond of sparkling personal quips, not easily subject to illusion, yet abandoning himself to an almost undiscriminating feeling of patriotism. When I read such books as *Le Feu* of Henri Barbusse, and those rare letters of soldiers and stories of surgeons, I

¹ *Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors*, p. 7.

² Thuc. ii. 41 (translated by A. E. Zimmern).

was reminded of the finely tempered sword of Thucydides: "For we are noted for being at once the most adventurous in action and the most reflective beforehand. Other men are bold in ignorance, while reflection will stop their onset. But the bravest are surely those who have the clearest vision of what is before them, glory and danger alike, and yet notwithstanding go out to meet it."¹ And when, this past summer, I came upon an analysis of Greek character made by Gilbert Murray, I found it might be applied, almost exactly phrase by phrase, to my friends in France these past few years: "Capable of bitter hatreds, of passionate desires, but instinctively hating cruelty; frugal, simple, and hardy to a degree which we can with difficulty realize; above all, possessed of an unusual power of seeing beyond himself and of understanding his enemies; caring for intellect, imagination, freedom, beauty, more than for force and organization, crying aloud for orderliness and symmetry because he knew his own needs and his own dangers."²

These are, I think, fairly important resemblances. They lead me to the conclusion that France is well fitted, because of the temper and ideals of her people, to be a congenial home of truly sympathetic Greek scholarship. This is not to say that France is without her shortcomings. As in the case of England and Germany, there are allowances to be made. For example, France is less healthy than Greece, more in need of sports and games. France is over-formalized and rigid in her institutions, less flexible than Athens. But this is not essential criticism.

Is France, then, producing the scholarship we should expect? The answer to that question is outside the limits of this discussion, but such names as Reinach, Cavaignac, and the Croisets suggest an answer. And that recently published book of value to prospective graduate students, entitled *Science and Learning in France*,³ indicates the seriousness and devotion of French classical scholarship today. Adopting a point of view genuinely Greek, we may not wisely judge its output by a quantitative standard.

¹ Thuc., ii. 40.

² Murray, *Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 113 (abridged).

³ *Science and Learning in France, with a Survey of Opportunities for American Students in French Universities*.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

HOMERIC REMINISCENCES

Readers of Homer are all familiar with the passage in the *Odyssey* (xi. 121-30, xxiii. 268-76) in which Teiresias addresses Odysseus: "Then take a handy oar and go on until you come to men who know not the sea nor eat food seasoned with salt, nor know purple-cheeked ships or handy oars, which are the wings of ships. And I shall tell you of a most manifest token and it shall not escape you. When another wayfarer shall meet you and say you have a winnowing-shovel on your glorious shoulder, then fasten the handy oar in the earth and offer fair sacrifices to lord Poseidon,"

Recently I chanced upon some curious parallels. From W. D. Howells' *A Woman's Reason* (Boston, 1883, p. 432): "When I put my foot on shore I ain't going to stop walking till I get where salt water is worth six dollars a quart; yes, sir, I'm going to start with an oar on my shoulder; and when some fellow asks me what *that* thing is, I'm going to rest, and not before." Also from a fine story, entitled *Sea*, by A. Karkavitsas (*Modern Greek Stories*, translated by Demetra Vaka and Aristides Phourtrides, New York, 1920, p. 41): "I was ready to give up the sea forever. I felt like St. Elias, who shouldered his oar and took to the mountains, looking for a place to live where men had never heard of his name. He didn't care either to look on the sea or to hear of it any longer."

In seeking further parallels I came upon a very suggestive note by Professor W. R. Halliday "Modern Greek Folk Tales," etc., in *Folk-Lore*, XXV [1914], 122-25) which should prove of interest to all Homeric students. Mr. Halliday refers to the instance given by Mr. F. W. Hasluck (*Cyzicus*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 65) and to two versions given by N. G. Polites in his *παραδόσεις* with a translation of the second. "St. Elias was once upon a time a sailor. What with pulling and pulling at the oar, (there was no spare time for meals in those days; they ate as they rowed), the poor man was tired of it. He took his oar on his shoulder and went off to go and find a place where they didn't even know the name of the thing. He goes to the village and asks, 'What do they call this?' 'An oar,' they say to him. He goes to the other village and asks,—'What do they call this?' 'An oar.' Och! The devil! He was in despair! Here, there, and everywhere he asks his question until he comes to a village on the top of the mountain. 'What do they call this?' he asks. 'A bit of wood.' Glory be to God! He sticks the oar upright, he builds a hut, and determines to remain there for the rest of his life. And that

is why they place St. Elias on all the mountain tops." Miss Mary Hamilton (*The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 1906-7, p. 356) quotes No. 207, the first of the two versions given by Polites. "St. Elias had been a sailor, but left the sea repenting of the evil life he had led. Others say he left because of the hardships he had suffered. He determined to go where it was not known what the sea or boats were. Shouldering an oar, he went on asking people what it was. When he came to the top of a hill he was told it was wood. He saw that they had never seen boats or the sea, and he stayed on the hill-tops."

Another interesting parallel is cited by Mr. A. B. Cook (*Zeus*, I [Cambridge, 1914], 171) on the authority of Dr. W. H. D. Rouse. An old Coan skipper tells the story. "'Ah well,' says Giorgis, 'tis a poor trade this, as the holy Elias found.' 'What was that?' I asked. 'The prophet Elias,' quoth he, 'was a fisherman; he had bad weather, terrific storms, so that he became afraid of the sea. Well, so he left his nets and his boat on the shore, and put an oar over his shoulder, and took to the hills. On the way, who should he see but a man. 'A good hour to you,' says he. 'Welcome,' says the man. 'What's this, can you tell me?' says St. Elias. 'That,' says the man, 'why that's an oar.' Eh, on he goes till he meets another man. 'A good hour to you,' says St. Elias. 'You are welcome' says the man. 'What's this?' says St. Elias. 'Why, that's an oar, to be sure,' says the man. On he goes again, until he comes to the very top of the mountain, and there he sees another man. 'Can you tell me what this is?' asks St. Elias. 'That,' says the man, 'Why, that's a stick.' 'Good!' says St. Elias, 'this is the place for me, here I abide.' He plants his oar in the ground, and that is why his chapels are all built on the hill tops."

The association of St. Elias with the tale appears only in the modern Greek versions. Precisely why it should be St. Elias I have been unable to learn. His worship is, of course, widespread and commonly associated with hilltops in Greece, and some scholars have assumed, on evidence not wholly convincing, that Elias has supplanted Helios—a case of popular etymology. The Greek tales therefore seem to be partly an aetiological attempt to account for the shrines of Elias on hilltops and partly a pure Homeric reminiscence. Mr. Howells' version, it is evident, was not derived from the modern Greek.

In *The (London) Times Literary Supplement* (September 11, 1919, p. 485) Mr. J. E. King writes: "A naval officer tells me that the boatswain of his ship, in speaking of his future retirement, said that he should walk inland with an oar on his shoulder, and when he met with people who asked him what he was carrying should settle there." He is struck by the resemblance to Homer, of course, and continues: "I was also told that the saying was not uncommon with sailors, but I have not had further confirmation of this." In the issue of September 18, 1919 (p. 499), Mr. Halliday calls attention to his note in *Folk-Lore* and reiterates his belief that the "modern version would seem to be one of the very rare cases of genuine direct survival from ancient to modern Greece." But he changes his opinion in consequence of a brief note contributed to the *Times' Supplement* (October 2, 1919, p. 533) by "R.N." who writes: "The

story of the retired sailor and the oar was told to me when I first went to sea in 1871, by a lieutenant about to retire under Childers' scheme. I don't think it was new then." Mr. Halliday's recantation (*Folk-Lore*, XXX [1910], 316-17) is, it seems to me, too readily made and on insufficient evidence. Always skeptical about ancient Greek survivals in folk-lore, he now writes: "The theory advanced in *Folk-Lore* . . . that the story of the sailor and his oar is confined to ancient and modern Greece is thereby invalidated." The passages from Howells and the sailor's saying, it is true, show that the tale is not confined to ancient and modern Greece in the literal sense of those words. But the fact that the story was current in British naval circles—or in other naval circles for that matter, which may have been influenced by Greek sailors—does not prove its independent origin. It is more than probable that in a profession where a certain amount of classical scholarship was traditional the striking passage from Homer was caught up by officers and passed on to seamen because it was so peculiarly a propos of a sailor's disgust with the sea. Until parallel versions can be furnished from sources where there can be no suspicion of Homeric influence (and I have failed to discover such), I think we are justified in considering Homer as the ultimate source of all the versions we have.

J. G. WINTER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE AORIST PARTICIPLE IN *ODYSSEY* ii. 3

In the *Journal of Philology*, No. 69, p. 128, Arthur Platt has this sentence: "Thrice does Homer assert that a man ὡρντ' ἄρ' ἐξ εὐηθίν, or εὐηθέν ἀνίστατο, εἴματα ἰστάμενος (β 2, δ 307, v 124'). I have looked in vain for any comment upon this extraordinary aorist participle, surely the most extraordinary in Greek, one might say."

Professor Gildersleeve wrote me a letter, asking me to investigate the problem of this aorist participle, an investigation the loss of vision prevented him from making. He added that a solution of this seeming difficulty might be found in the assumption that Telemachus slept with no other clothing than that furnished by the bed-coverings and that when he arose in the morning he slipped his garment on before leaving the bed, hence the participle is a true aorist. There can be no doubt that this is the correct explanation. If one will turn back to the story of the young man's retirement the previous night he will find that all difficulties vanish, for then Telemachus sat on his bed and took off his chiton, which the nurse folded and hung close to the bed παρὰ τρητοῖσι λέχεσσιν. Wilamowitz could find no explanation for the verse which describes the undressing,

a 437 ἔξετο δ' ἐν λέκτρῳ, μαλακὸν δ' ἔκδυνε χιτῶνα.

and he exclaimed: "Wer kann ein bis auf füsse reichendes hemnde im sitzen ausziehen? Warum ist der junge mann so müde, dass er sich dazu hinsetz?" This, of course, is the height of absurdity, but it is characteristic of the way Wilamowitz never seeks or finds explanations for very simple things.

The thing is perfectly plain; Telemachus did not undress until he had reached his bed, while in the morning the process was reversed, for he did not leave his bed until he had slipped on his chiton. The phrase in the first book *ἔζετο ἐν λέκτρῳ* shows that the aorist participle in the next book is the proper tense, while that aorist participle proves that the phrase in the first book is original and genuine. They both tell the same story.

Telemachus slept naked except for the fact that he wrapped himself in a fleece *κεκαλυμένος οἰδης ἀώτῳ*.

The Homeric Greek went to sleep unclad, but he had a certain modesty about exposing his person and did not needlessly appear naked, as is shown by the fact that athletes girded up their loins in their contests *ως γο*, while in later times their nakedness was not thus covered.

It need not shock us to find that the Homeric Greeks slept thus, for even Lady Macbeth wore no more than they. In *Macbeth*, Act V, scene 1, it is told how she arose, "threw her nightgown upon her" and moved around the room, "all in a fast sleep."

The aorist participle in β 3 is plainly the normal aorist, and the translation is: "Telemachus, throwing on his chiton, left his bed."

In that same paper by Arthur Platt occurs this sentence p. 130: "The most remarkable aorist participle with a future sense which is to be found in Homer is at II 852:

ἀλλά τοι ήδη
δύχι παρέστηκεν θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή
χερσὶ δαμέντ' Ἀχιλῆος ἀμύμονος Αλακίδαο.

Indeed I should have liked to propose *δαμῆναι* if only the last syllable could be elided."

The aorist participle can refer to future time, and the normal way to write in Greek such a sentence as, "I will collect the troops and ride into the city," would be as follows: *συλλέξας τοὺς στρατιώτας ἔλω εἰς τὴν πόλιν*. Death and hard fate did not come to Hector until he had been vanquished at the hands of Achilles. There is no trouble with the aorist participle in the passage from Homer, the only notable thing about it is the prophetic use of the perfect indicative in which a future act is pictured as already accomplished. This use of the perfect resembles that in Xenophon's *Anabasis* i. 8, where Cyrus encouraged the Greeks to attack the center and the king, "for if we conquer that part, then we shall have won all." *ἄν τοῦτο νικῶμεν, πάνθ' ἡμῖν πεποίηται*. The Greek who wrote the prose paraphrase of the *Iliad* found no difficulty with the aorist participle, for he used the aorist participle of *ἀποθνήσκω* in his version.

The simple translation of that passage in II, "Already death and hard fate stand near thee vanquished at the hands of Achilles," shows that no other participle than the aorist, or perhaps the perfect, could have been used.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Julianne A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Miss Bertha Green, Hollywood High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.]

Connecticut

New Haven.—The Connecticut section of the New England Classical Association has acquired the habit of meeting the last Saturday in October either at a college or secondary school. Last year, under the leadership of Miss M. Louise Nichols, Mr. Keep entertained the club royally at the Porter School, in Farmington. This year, under the guiding hand of Professor Hubbell, the framer of the program, Yale College proved an equally gracious host.

At eleven o'clock in Lampson Hall, Professor Williston Walker, Provost of the University, gave the address of welcome. Mr. Harley F. Roberts, of the Taft School, followed with a spirited plea on the "Need of Individual Work with Boys." Miss Anna MacVey, Dean of the Wadleigh High School, New York, read a paper on "Vocabulary Joys." Both these papers were briefly discussed. The morning session closed with a paper by Professor Hendrickson of Yale on "Marks of Incompleteness in the *Aeneid*." Then, after what the program with unwarranted modesty called "Luncheon" at Memorial Hall, Professor Harmon read the final paper on "A New Contact with the Age of the Antonines." As these papers will probably be published, any abstract is out of order.

At the business meeting the following committee was elected for the coming year: Mr. Harley F. Roberts, chairman; Dean Irene Nye, Miss Alice Hammond, and Dr. J. E. Barss, permanent secretary. The club accepted a cordial invitation from the Taft School to meet there next year.

Mississippi

University of Mississippi.—In a certain university there circulates this story: A professor of Latin, who desired to have his class of sophomores feel that they were not dealing merely with forms, syntax, and etymologies, said: "You must see with Roman eyes, you must hear with Roman ears."

A sophomore said: "Professor, must we smell with a Roman nose?" There came back: "Yes, smell with a Roman nose."

The Latin Club at the University is proving a valuable adjunct to the work that is done in the lecture-rooms. It is aiding in impressing on the student the importance of seeing with "Roman eyes," et cetera. The programs are carefully planned in advance, and a committee which has the matter in hand undertakes to make the meetings instructive, inspirational, and recreational. There is little machinery. The students elect their own officers consisting of a president, vice-president, and secretary-treasurer. Associated with these, composing the executive committee, is a student chosen from each class, and a member of the classical faculty chosen by them as adviser. The president appoints each month an entertainment committee whose duty it is to look after the refreshments. The dues are fifty cents for the session. The meetings are held monthly.

In October they met to honor Virgil's birthday, which occurred on the Ides. There were Latin songs by the club. Brown's Latin Songs, compiled by a member of this faculty, were used. Next followed a talk on "Virgil as a Writer and Man" by one of the professors. One of the students then recited Tennyson's "Roman Vergil," and another gave a reading "in lighter vein." There followed an informal discussion of Virgil as artist and man.

An important feature of each meeting is a report on current events in the classical field by a student. The material is culled mainly from the *Classical Journal*, *Classical Weekly*, *Art and Archaeology*. But the daily newspaper also affords valuable material.

The University is situated in a wooded park all its own, and the suggestion that the November meeting be held in the open met with an enthusiastic response. A short walk brought the club to the "castra." The president with some members of the club had gone in advance, and when the remainder reached the place they found convenient logs arranged and a fire alight. The larder had not been neglected, and the evening meal was cooked over the camp fire. True to Roman tradition, there were *tomacula lardumque cum pane*. At the end there came *mala et crustula*. The anachronism of hot coffee with cream and sugar offended no sensibilities. They only felt that we were having something very good which even Lucullus had missed.

There were songs and stories by the camp fire. Among them figured Pliny's *Haunted House* and the *First Airplane*. When the fire burned low, the club adjourned to a professor's residence that was near and concluded the program. In it Horace and the Sabine farm were given a prominent place. There were about forty in attendance at the November meeting.

Missouri

Columbia.—The Classical Club of the University of Missouri, last session, devoted its attention to the reading of selected tragedies of Euripides. Meeting

once a month the club read from the original and briefly discussed the Alcestis Andromache, Bacchae, Cyclops, Hercules Furens, and Medea. This year the club, with about thirty members, is endeavoring to read and interpret the works of Virgil. A little more than a book and a half of the *Aeneid* is covered each evening, the members taking turns in bearing the burdens of responsibility.

New Hampshire

Laconia.—The Annual meeting of the New Hampshire branch of the Classical Association of New England was held in Laconia, November 22, in connection with the State Teachers' Convention.

The President, Mr. Harlan T. Bisbee, principal of Robinson Female Seminary, presided and presented the following program which was both profitable and pleasing to the audience:

"The Vitalizing of Latin," Mr. Carl Purinton of Berlin; "The Value of Supervised Study," Miss Bertha Manuel of Franklin High School; "An Appreciation of the Life of Dr. Charles Sigourney Knox, Late of St. Paul's School, Concord," Rev. Loren Webster; "Evolution and the Classics," Professor Royal C. Nemiah of Dartmouth College.

After some discussions on the questions connected with plans formulating by the state department, the matter of a central classical library to be located in Concord was taken up. Miss Mary J. Wellington, of Manchester High School, who has worked most faithfully during the year as chairman of the Library Committee, reported progress, and hopes are entertained that reference books may be obtained for use in the rural schools.

The following officers were elected for the coming year: President, Headmaster Lee T. Gray, of Portsmouth; Vice-President, Miss Abbott of Laconia; Secretary and Treasurer, Miss Anne G. Towle of Manchester; Executive Committee, Professor H. E. Burton, Dartmouth College; Headmaster Charles Wallace, Dover.

North Carolina

Greensboro.—The students of Greensboro College for Women who are taking elective Latin have organized under the direction of Professor Linnie M. Ward a classical club known as the *Sorores Togatae*. Only students who elect Latin in the Sophomore year or thereafter are eligible to membership. The underlying purpose of the club is to heighten and to perpetuate interest in classical life and literature. Great care is exercised in planning the programs in order that the students may reach the objective in the constitution and the pledge of the organization. The members of the *Sorores Togatae* appear in toga at the forum meetings once a month. The officers don the crimson toga while the other members wear white ones with crimson or purple borders. The pure white toga may be worn only by members who have completed the third year of college Latin. Proper ceremony accompanies the celebration of the

donning of the latter. Unusual enthusiasm permeates the club, and the interest in things classical is being caught up and passed on to the other members of the college household.

Ohio

Delaware.—At Ohio Wesleyan University, Professor Charles L. Sherman, a graduate of Harvard, *summa cum laude*, with highest final honors in Classics, has joined the department this year and is giving courses in both Latin and Greek. A large number of students are taking elementary work in Latin, almost fifty being enrolled in the course in Beginning Latin and about thirty in Caesar. The instruction in these sections is given by several practice teachers under the supervision of a member of the department.

The Latin Club has an interesting program planned for the year. At a recent meeting a dramatic version of the story of Pyramus and Thisbe, prepared by Professor Robinson, was performed by the newly elected members of the club. Preparations are now being made for the singing of Latin Christmas carols around the city of Delaware, as was so successfully done last year. Some of these carols are old Latin hymns of the nativity, but more modern hymns, translated into Latin by Professor Robinson, are also used by the club as, for example, the following version of "Silent Night":

Alma nox, sancta nox,
Natalis est Christi.
O puer laudabilis
Dulcis et amabilis
Matris nunc in sinu,
Matris nunc in sinu.

Alma nox, sancta nox,
Pastores veniunt.
Alleluia cantant caeli
Beatissimi angeli
Pax et hominibus,
Pax et hominibus.

Alma nox, sancta nox,
Veniunt a Saba
Tus et aurum et myrrha
Regum splendida munera,
Christus est apud nos,
Christus est apud nos.

The Latin Club is also planning to give in Holy Week its annual performance of *Christus Triumphant*, a morality play of the Passion and Resurrection, arranged by Professor Robinson. The characters in this play are

the Spirit of Religion, Mary Magdalene, the Angel at the Tomb, the Spirit of the Gospels, and a chorus of angels. The account given is the version of the Vulgate, interspersed with many beautiful old Latin hymns appropriate to the text, and the play created a deep impression when it was performed for the first time last Holy Week. There have been many calls for copies of this play which can be obtained at the price of twenty-five cents each from Professor Dwight Nelson Robinson, Delaware, Ohio.

Tennessee

Knoxville.—The East Tennessee Teachers' Association met in Knoxville October 28, 29, and 30. The Latin Section held two meetings, one on Thursday and one on Friday afternoons. The interest at the Latin section meetings was easily equal to that shown in any of the other department meetings. More Latin teachers are present at these East Tennessee Teachers' Association meetings than at any other educational occasion and opportunity was taken to press the claims of the *Classical Journal* and of the *Classical Weekly* and to secure members for the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

The program was as follows: "The Relation of the Classics to English," Dr. Gilbert, Department of English, University of Tennessee; "The Geography of the Gallic War and of the Recent War," Professor C. E. Little, George Peabody College; "Teaching First-Year Latin," Miss Sensabaugh, Central High School; "Relation of Latin to Scientific Terms," Professor Fortner, Department of Biology, University of Tennessee; Illustrated lecture on Vergil, Dr. R. S. Radford; "Place of Latin in Education," Professor Harry Clark, School of Education, University of Tennessee; A Play, Pupils of Miss Duncan's class, Park City High School.

Texas

Fort Worth.—The classical section of the Texas State Teachers' Association met in Fort Worth on November 26 and 27. The meetings were enthusiastically attended and gave evidence that the Latin teachers of Texas are very much alive and eager for any devices to improve their teaching. Miss Frances E. Sabin of Wisconsin gave with unsparing energy, talks, formal and informal, which added inspiration to the already eager audience. From Miss Sabin's display of graphic methods from the Wisconsin Latin laboratory teachers took away note-books and minds filled with new ideas. Miss Roberta Lavender stressed the far-reaching benefit of Latin as a foundation of the Romance languages. She made us more fully realize that, along with the exact sciences and mathematics, we must depend upon Latin for solid mental food in this age of turmoil and upheaval when many are attracted by glitter rather than by gold.

Dr. W. J. Battle of the University of Texas stressed the cultural value of Latin as an antidote for materialism, showing how the cultured mind holds within itself sources and resources for its pleasure and entertainment which

skilled craftsmanship without mental culture lacks. Dr. Battle affirmed that only thinking people could safely decide the world's big questions, that Christianity and culture alone could keep the world safe for democracy and that the classics contributed much toward the problems of civilization by broadening one's outlook and sharpening his intellect.

There was a memorial service for Dr. Fay where former students and friends, by their words of appreciation and love, paid rich tribute to that rare man of great soul and mind.

Wisconsin

Milwaukee.—The seventh annual reception and luncheon of the Wisconsin Latin Teachers' Association was held at the Blatz Hotel from 12:15 to 2:00 P.M., the president, Miss Grace Goodrich, presiding. Forty-five were present, seven of these being guests. Six girls of the Milwaukee Riverside High-School Latin classes entertained with clever parodies on some of the popular songs, with the accompaniment of ukeleles. *Gaudemus Igitur* was also sung by the whole assembled company. Miss Lena B. Tomson of Milwaukee Dower College read the *Moretum*, and Mr. H. P. Boody, professor of English at Ripon College, gave a brief address on the Humanities. A wedding cake, mustaceus, made according to an ancient recipe, was displayed by Miss Goodrich.

The conference proper of the Association met in the assembly hall of the Milwaukee University School at 2:20 P.M. About ninety-five were present. The chairman appointed Mr. Henry C. Martens, of Milwaukee North Division High School, and Professor J. N. Daland, of Milton College, as an auditing committee. A nominating committee also was appointed.

The committee recommended the following officers for the year 1920-21. Their report was unanimously accepted by the Association: President, Professor A. H. Weston, Lawrence College, Appleton; Vice-President, Miss Maude E. Hinckley, Beloit High School; Secretary-Treasurer, Roland W. Zinns, Washington High School, Milwaukee; Executive Committee, Miss Helen Eaton, Oshkosh High School, Mrs. Anne C. Ryder, Fond du Lac High School.

AMERICAN CLASSICAL LEAGUE

Members of all classical associations are strongly urged to join the American Classical League, which is the only *national* body representing *all* the classical interests in the United States.

We are entering on the second year of our work in behalf of the maintenance, extension, and improvement of classical education. We want and need the help of every friend of the classics. Last year we enrolled about 1,200 members. We want to increase this membership to at least 2,500 this year. The annual dues to members of recognized classical associations are

fixed at the nominal sum of twenty-five cents. Dues for this year begin September 1, 1920, and are payable through the treasurer of your classical association, or may be sent directly to Professor Shirley H. Weber, Treasurer, Princeton, N.J.

Persons not members of classical associations may join the League upon the payment of one dollar. A contribution of twenty-five dollars enrolls the donor as a life-member. Please help us in getting as many life-memberships as possible. Please help in circulating widely the publications of the League, which are *sold at cost*.

ANDREW F. WEST
President, American Classical League

Book Reviews

Materials and Methods of Literary Criticism: Lyric, Epic, and Allied Forms of Poetry. By C. M. GAYLEY AND B. P. KURTZ. Ginn & Co., 1920. Pp. xi+911.

This volume continues the very useful work on the bases, theoretical and historical, of literary criticism published twenty years ago. It undertakes to provide critics and historians of literature with an orientation in the methods and materials of their study. The two types of poetry covered in this volume are taken up, first, with reference to theories of origin and development, secondly, in respect to the history of the types in the various nations. Extensive bibliography marks every stage of the work, and brief critical analyses both of books and of the theories involved are provided. Nor should one overlook the statements of problems, not only those hitherto discussed but others awaiting solution. The helpfulness of such a compilation can hardly be overestimated.

Testing the book from the standpoint of a student of the classical types of literature one is impressed by the completeness of the bibliographical material and by the discrimination of the editors when selection is necessary. Not only have the obvious manuals been digested, such as Christ-Schmid and Schanz and the articles on literary types in Pauly-Wissowa, but the editors have read and analyzed much of the material furnished by such sources and not infrequently brought the subject up to date by independent collection from the more recent periodical literature. The classical student will find his vision profitably enlarged through this treatment of literary types which constantly suggests comparison with the evolution of the same types in other countries. Furthermore, the problems raised often indicate profitable lines of study for classical students; so, for instance, the unworked field of study in Hellenistic epic is sketched on page 680. Both types are broadly defined so that under lyric epigram is included, and under epic the minor forms of narrative verse such as the pastoral and the idyl.

Some adverse comment may perhaps be met by the retort that the standpoint of the editors is broader than that of the ordinary classicist. But at least from our more limited range the cursory reference to the epyllium on page 683 does no justice to a type that is historically very interesting even if it did not issue in important results outside of classical literature; a parenthetical reference to the "Culex, Ciris, Moretum, etc., " is a strange way of dismissing one of the most significant minor types of classical poetry. Nor can we be content with the handling of the pastoral and the idyl on

pages 443, 445 ff., and 611 ff. The editors admit that the ancient world had no conception of the idyl as a literary type, but they persist in treating the idyl as a narrative form of poetry in connection with the epic although its historical development in Greece brings it into close relation with the mime; its dramatic features, therefore, are original, and its origin explains its distinguishing qualities. Historically the pastoral "idyl" is nothing but a form of country mime (doubtless affected somewhat by the verse and style of epic), and essentially Theocritus' Syracusan idyl is of a piece with any one of his bucolic poems. The classical "idyl," in any such treatment as the editors are undertaking, includes Herondas, of whom the volume makes no mention; and the town eclogues of English literature are a reversion, perhaps unconscious, to the oneness of city mime and country mime.

Such minor points, however, do not detract from the great usefulness of the book, and we hope that we may not have to wait another twenty years before the third volume, on the dramatic types, is added to the series.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

W. S. Teuffels Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Siebente Auflage, neu bearbeitet von W. KROLL und F. SKUTSCH. Zweiter Band. Leipzig: Teubner, 1920. Pp. vi+341, 8vo.

It has been reported that in Germany industrial and financial conditions are so difficult at the present time as to make it impossible to publish scientific works in the field of classical philology. Yet it is precisely in this year that Teubner proceeds to put out in a seventh edition this indispensable handbook for all serious students of Latin letters. The new publication begins somewhat inconveniently with the second volume, which covers the period from 31 B.C. to 96 A.D. For this *hysteron proteron* order the example of the sixth edition is doubtless responsible. Of that edition the second volume was published in 1910, the third in 1913, and the first not until 1916. In the present issue the name of Skutsch still appears with that of Kroll as joint editor, doubtless *pietatis causa*, since Skutsch had been able to contribute something to the preparation of the preceding edition before his lamented death in 1912. The somewhat drastic abbreviation found necessary before 1910 is reproduced in this edition also. Indeed, the present volume is even a few pages shorter than its predecessor of ten years ago. The condensation, along with the inclusion of recent literature, has been made possible chiefly by cutting out some of the less useful citations, and by omitting (to the detriment of appearance) leads between paragraphs. It is excusable that some important studies published in foreign countries during the war years are not noticed. A careful reading and comparison of selected passages shows

that much unobtrusive work of improvement has been done on the text. It is to be hoped that a general index to the entire three volumes will ultimately be issued in such a form that it may be eventually bound in at the end of the third volume.

The price of this second volume is announced by the publishers in terms of American coinage as "geheftet 70 Ct., gebunden 1 Doll. 5 Ct.," with the fateful additional note, "Hierzu Teuerungszuschlag des Verlags ab April 1920 100%." Doubtless to this must be added also the *Zuschlaege* of the present union of German booksellers imposed upon all sales to foreign customers. This ingenious device is of course meant to deprive the presumably yet hostile customer of much of the advantage he may gleefully hope to gain through the tremendous fall in value of the German mark in international exchange. We wonder if the German book-trade does not lose more than it makes by this discrimination against the foreigner. French booksellers still sell their wares to Americans at the same price in francs as to their own countrymen. Therein they are probably wise as well as just.

E. T. M.

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained from Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City; The F. C. Stechert & Co. 29-35 West 32d St., New York City.

- AESCHYLUS. *Agamemnon, after the Greek of Aeschylus.* By Locke Ellis. London: Selwyn and Blount. Pp. 92. 4s. 6d. net.
- ARISTOTLE. *On the Art of Poetry.* Translated by Ingram Bywater. With a preface by Gilbert Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Pp. 95. 7s. 6d. net.
- ARISTOTLE. *Atheniensium Respublica.* Ed. F. G. Kenyon. (Oxford Classical Texts.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. net.
- COUTTS, FRANCIS, and POLLOCK, W. H. *Icarian Flights.* Translations of some of the odes of Horace. London: John Lane. Pp. 134. 6s. 6d. net.
- ELLIS, HUBERT DYNES. *English Verse Translations of Selections from the Odes of Horace, the Epigrams of Martial, and Other Writers.* London: published by the author, 7 Roland Gardens, S.W. 7. Pp. vii+69.
- GREENFELD, BERNARD P., and HUNT, ARTHUR S. *The Oxyrhyncus Papyri, Part XIV.* Edited with translation and notes. (Egypt Exploration Society.) New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. xiv+244. \$19.00 net.
- HORACE. *The Odes of Horace.* Translated into English verse by Lionel Lancelot Shadwell. With the Latin text. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp. 264. 7s. 6d. net.
- LIVY. *Books VI-X.* Ed. C. F. Walters and R. S. Conway. (Oxford Classical Texts.) New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. xxviii+384. \$2.70.
- MANILIUS. *Astronomicon, Liber Quartus.* Ed. A. E. Housman. London: Grant Richards. Pp. xviii+130. 6s. net.
- VERGIL. *The Sixth Book of the Aeneid.* With introduction and notes by H. C. Butler. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp. 289. 12s. net.
- WATT, Lauchlan MacLean. *Douglas's Aeneid.* New York: Macmillan (Cambridge University Press). Pp. xi+252. \$5.60 net.